



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 26, 2013

No. 93

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 26, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable REID J. RIBBLE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

ACKNOWLEDGING THE LIFE OF PEARL S. BUCK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This morning, Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the memory and the life of Pearl S. Buck, an author, humanitarian, and political activist who made her home in Hilltown, Bucks County on Green Hills Farm, where she wrote 100 books.

During this week, the anniversary of her 121st birthday, we note that Pearl Buck is the first American woman to

receive the Nobel Prize and Pulitzer Prize for literature. A prolific writer, she also advocated on behalf of women's rights and minority groups, while her efforts for her care and adoption of Asian and mixed-race children are legendary. Pearl Buck will be remembered for her achievements as well as for her writing.

And we acknowledge the renovation recently of her 19th century farmhouse in Bucks County, notably a national historic landmark that will be sustained for new generations to learn and emulate Pearl Buck's love for the struggling, the misunderstood, and the children.

We honor her life and we treasure her memory.

HONORING THE CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, after 23 NHL Playoff games, 10 overtimes, and 64 goals, the Chicago Blackhawks have won their second Stanley Cup in the last 4 years. Congratulations to the greatest team in hockey on being the 2013 Stanley Cup Champions.

The impressive regular season began with a record-breaking streak of 24 straight games with a point earned, and it ended with a Presidents' Trophy for the most points in a regular season. This success set the stage for an outstanding playoff run, a promise of things to come. The Hawks made good on that promise this week in one of the most incredible and improbable Stanley Cup Final games in NHL history.

Having already tamed the Minnesota Wild, taken down our archrival, the Detroit Red Wings, and dethroned the Los Angeles Kings, the Blackhawks grinded through the finals to one of the craziest and most exciting Stanley Cup wins ever witnessed.

To say this championship winning game was a nail-biter would be an understatement. The Blackhawks came from behind twice to overcome an amazing effort by the Boston Bruins, scoring two goals just 17 seconds apart in the final minute and a half of the game. Unbelievable goals scored by Bryan Bickell and Dave Bolland ensured their names will be inscribed forever in Blackhawk history books as well as on Lord Stanley's Cup.

With outstanding efforts by Captain Jonathan Toews; Conn Smythe winner, Buffalo native, Patrick Kane; the best defenseman in hockey, Duncan Keith; and, of course, the best goalie in the playoffs, Corey Crawford, the entire team made good on a promise that this Original Six team is a true legend to be reckoned with.

As I have mentioned before, hockey never left Chicago, but Rocky Wirtz brought it back. The owner of the Blackhawks has once again made our city proud.

The entire organization is the classiest in sports, the model in hockey. Led by John McDonough, Jay Blunk, Stan Bowman, and Coach Joel Quenneville, they have enshrined Chicago as a hockey town for the 21st century.

But the Blackhawks don't just unify our city, they also are committed to serving the community and making it better. Their StreetHawks program has worked to promote fitness and leadership skills to local youth through street hockey initiatives and community skating facilities.

Through the NHL's Hockey is for Everyone program, I've had the pleasure of working with the Hawks to expand hockey access to at-risk and LGBT youth; because no matter what your background, every child should have the opportunity to play the greatest sport in the world.

The Blackhawks have also been strong supporters of America's veterans and wounded warriors. Just this

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4041

year, I joined the Hawks and the USA Warriors veterans team for an outdoor hockey game at Soldier Field. The Hawks gave these vets—most of whom are Purple Heart recipients—a once-in-a-lifetime experience they will never forget.

And I suppose this is what the Hawks do best, provide their fans—fans in Chicago and around the world—with memories they will never forget. I look forward to the new memories yet to be made during future Stanley Cup victories, games with Blackhawk players who are just kids right now with the memory of shots heard around the hockey world ringing through their heads.

Mr. Speaker, hockey is a special sport that brings people together, improves our communities, and, most importantly, makes people dream the impossible and do the improbable. The entire world saw that this week thanks to the 2013 Stanley Cup Champion Chicago Blackhawks.

Go Hawks. And as always, my kind of town, Chicago is.

OBAMA'S WAR ON COAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, American coal families are under attack, not from a foreign power or a natural disaster, but by an administration that has resolutely, perversely, and now overtly proposed to end coal mining and coal-fired power generation in these United States.

President Obama's calamitous climate change plan announced yesterday is the latest job-killing bomb to be dropped on Kentucky, West Virginia, Illinois, and dozens of coal States already knocked down after 4 years of administration policies. This administration has used code words like "streamlining" and "permit reviews" to shell our communities with regulations and red tape that even the most sophisticated businesses can't adhere to.

Now the White House is dismantling our strategic energy advantage and unilaterally disarming our economy in broad daylight. I quote White House climate adviser Daniel Schrag straight out of the White House: "A war on coal is exactly what's needed."

Mr. Speaker, a war on coal is exactly what is not needed. A war on coal is a war on middle class Americans. It's a war on jobs, all kinds of jobs. It's already claimed 5,700 direct Kentucky jobs in just a year and a half, the vast majority of those in my economically challenged district.

There is no recovery in Inez or high-tech boom in Harlan, Mr. President. My families are struggling to get back to work, pay their bills, or find salaries comparable to coal mining. And my communities are losing their main employers. This climate plan makes the situation worse, dimming the prospects of reopening the mines even further.

Moreover, this disastrous climate change plan is a plan for America's economic and security decline. This plan would only lead to higher electric bills and increased dependence on foreign enemy sources. And to think someone has the audacity to say, "We need a war on coal." Well, what we need is a war on that line of thinking.

This administration's stringent rules and absurd mandates are simply meant to force coal-fired power plants to stop burning coal or shutter the facilities altogether. I call it strangulation by regulation.

□ 1010

Mr. Speaker, more than 200 coal plants have already closed across 25 States, and now seven new EPA regulations are on track to do even more damage. I'm losing one of the biggest employers in Lawrence County to this onslaught—1,200 good-paying jobs.

In total, the closure of mines, shuttering of power plants, and resulting hikes in electric rates are expected to cost the U.S. economy some 887,000 jobs per year. Please tell me how this is in our national interest, how this is leading America forward. In 2008, the President promised to bankrupt the coalfields. And yesterday, he took a giant step toward that reckless, shameful goal.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, in 5 days, the student loan interest rate will double. It will go from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. That is a \$4,500 increase for many college students. At a time when they're struggling to make ends meet, struggling to pay their tuition and their housing expenses to prepare to join the workforce and build careers and at a time when they're struggling to pay their debts, we're going to increase their debt.

I want to commend to my colleagues a report that just came out from the Joint Economic Committee staff that talks about how student loan debt has skyrocketed over the past several years. Here's how the study concludes:

The increasing debt burden presents challenges for recent graduates just beginning their careers and poses a potential risk to the economy, since individuals who shoulder heavier debt balances may delay purchasing a home, buying a car, starting a family, and saving for retirement. On average, recent graduates left college with student loan debt of 60 percent of their annual income.

Mr. Speaker, 60 percent of their annual income will be spent paying back their debts from college. And if we don't compromise, it's going to be even more than that.

I've always believed, and I know many of my colleagues have always believed, that you build an economy by building the middle class. And you expand the middle class by making sure

that middle class families can afford college and that college is accessible. I do not understand an economic strategy that says that you make it harder and more expensive for the middle class to go to college; nor do I understand an argument that we cannot afford to keep the interest rate low, but we can spend \$40 billion subsidizing the five richest oil companies in America who do not need those subsidies.

The middle class deserves those subsidies. Middle class students trying to get into college deserve subsidies. But to say that they cannot have those subsidies and that we're going to double the interest rate on them while preserving a \$40 billion subsidy to the richest oil companies on Earth is not only bad policy; it's ruinous economic strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why anybody in this body would want to make it harder and more difficult for students to go to college at a time when we are competing with China and South Korea and other countries around the world to continue our strength and power over the next several decades.

It is essential that we find a compromise, Mr. Speaker. There is an unquenchable thirst by Americans for compromise in this body. I, for one, as well as members of the House Democratic Caucus, am ready, willing, and able to compromise over the next 5 days. We just need somebody to compromise with. We need a compromise that is fair to the middle class, puts middle class families first, puts college students first, puts college affordability first, and puts partisan politics aside.

SECURING THE BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the border surge over in the Senate. In typical Senate-think, they have seen a problem and decided to throw money at the problem, even if a lack of funding is not the problem they are facing.

This map divides the country up into the Border Patrol sectors. The numbers are from 2010. The numbers are different today but, obviously, the ratios are about the same. In this year, one has to ask the question of why were 56 illegal entries apprehended in the main sector and 200,000 apprehended in the Arizona sector. What was the difference between those two?

If you were trying to sneak into a baseball game, something I'm not advocating, but if you were trying to do that, you don't jump over the turnstile where a cop is standing. You go around the corner and find the hole in the fence so no one will actually see what you are doing. The drug cartels are not stupid. They are looking for that hole in the fence. Obviously, this sector is where the majority of the illegals and

the illegal drugs and the illegal human trafficking and potential terrorism exists.

So the question has to be: Why is that the entrance level of choice? It's actually very simple. Everything that is red is land that's owned by the Federal Government on this map. In Arizona, 80 percent of the border is owned by the Federal Government. Over half of that is in the "Wilderness" category, "Endangered Species," or "Conservation Habitat" category, where, by special law, the legislation provides this land a special status which prohibits the Border Patrol from entering that area. They can't enter in a motorized vehicle. They can't even pedal a bicycle. They can go into that area on foot, on specially fed horses, and that is it. The drug cartels recognize this. They're not stupid. And they realize that this is the problem.

When this Congress insisted a fence be built along the California border, we passed legislation that waived 40 environmental laws that were prohibiting the fence from being built. Those same 40 laws are the laws that prohibit the Border Patrol from going along the red areas of that border and doing their job, which simply means, as ironic as it sounds, Federal law is stopping the Federal Border Patrol from going on Federal land to do a Federal purpose, which is federally stupid. But this is, indeed, what we're doing.

The Border Patrol actually cares about the environment. Drug cartels don't at all. This cacti, cut down by the drug cartel, is an endangered species. It was cut down there to stop east-west access on the only road that allows the Border Patrol to follow in that particular area.

This truck is a temporary sensor device in a wilderness area. The Border Patrol wanted to move it from point A to point B. It took them 6 months to get approval by the land manager in that area before they could back the truck up and move the truck over to another stop because the land manager was not happy with the Border Patrol being in his Wilderness territory. And the law was on the side of the land manager, not on the side of the Border Patrol.

The Senate has tried to say that they're coming up with a compromise solution to increase border security. In actuality, they have done just the opposite. They have put language in there that says that the Homeland Security Secretary can, notwithstanding any other law, require certain elements to be built in this particular area. But that allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to have the political discretion of whether to do it or not. It allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to have immediate access into these border areas, but only in Arizona. If they go anywhere else along this border, they have to have the written approval of the Secretary of the Interior as well as the Secretary of Agriculture. And most importantly, it says in there

that the manner in which the Homeland Security Secretary shall make these decisions must be in the manner that best protects the natural and cultural resources on Federal land.

I'm sorry, but as soon as they put that language in there, it requires some bureaucrat to establish what the standard is, and it opens it up to someone else initiating litigation that that is not the best standard possible. In essence, we're back in a worse situation.

They wish to have another 25,000 Border Patrol agents. This is what our fence looks like in Arizona today. This is a fence, this is Mexico, that's Arizona, and the open area is the animal habitat to allow animals to go back and forth from Mexico and Arizona. The one road on here is the only road in which the Border Patrol is allowed to go. You can have another 100,000 agents in that area, and you'll simply find out that it won't help unless you let them go outside of that one road.

We don't need money. What we need is access. What the Senate is proposing is actually worse than the status quo.

□ 1020

CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, the impacts of climate change can no longer be denied—superstorm hurricanes, massive tornados, record-breaking droughts and heat spells, accelerating melting of glaciers, and increasing ocean salinity. Due to the effects of climate change, many highly populated communities at low elevation face increasing pressure from storms and rising waters, potentially driving massive migrations to higher ground. If we continue on this path, extensive and severe droughts will hurt food production and fresh water supplies in the United States. Similar occurrences around the world will certainly be destabilizing and potentially draw the United States into dangerous conflicts.

Most climate change models predict increasing severity of these and other effects. However, the reality is that most computer models are being outpaced as the carbon buildup and energy trapped in the atmosphere accelerates.

Despite these developments, there is an increasing partisan divide on the issue of climate change. Many of my Republican colleagues are either in complete denial that global warming is happening, don't believe human activity is causing the problem, or think that it would be too expensive to take the necessary steps to mitigate and adapt to global warming. This gross partisan behavior in denial of science is becoming a clear and present threat to our national security and well-being.

Would we sit by if a foreign power built up a threatening military force

on one of our borders? Of course not. And yet, climate change presents a threat that's just as dangerous.

So what will it take for this Nation to greatly reduce carbon we are adding to the atmosphere and begin the process of preparing for the changes that are coming? Will it take a global weather catastrophe? Will it take several more Hurricane Sandy's? How many years of drought will the Midwest be forced to endure?

With global warming, the signs of change are overwhelming. We cannot wait for a global catastrophe that will impose massive suffering enough to overcome our civil institutions. Our national security depends on us taking action now.

The good news is that if we do take action now, the cost is affordable and the benefits are significant. Even if climate change were not a threat, reducing our consumption of fossil fuels will make the environment cleaner and energy costs less volatile. Increasing energy efficiency will greatly reduce family utility bills while making our homes more comfortable. Using renewable energy creates stable jobs. On the other hand, if we wait until a global or regional climate catastrophe forces desperate action, the consequences will be expensive and possibly deadly.

Those who reject science and deny human-caused climate change are fostering a dangerous threat to our Nation's future and to future generations of all Americans. I hope that those who deny the effects of climate change see the danger that they are subjecting our Nation to, or that the voters elect representatives who will take the responsible actions necessary to address the imminent threat of climate change.

WILDFIRE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, the West Fork Complex Fire—acreage burning now in Colorado—is more than 141 square miles and counting. The East Peak Fire—over 13,000 acres and counting. These are just two of the fires that are burning in my district now, and it is still early summer. Tens of thousands of acres of forests are already gone and entire communities are being threatened.

Brave men and women are working around-the-clock to be able to stop this devastation. They are truly incredible, and I want to thank all of them for all they are doing to be able to protect property, save lives, and to be able to contain these wildfires.

Just like the wildfires that have ravaged our State over the last decade, these fires have destroyed property and are doing irreversible damage to the environment—to the fragile ecologies and watersheds on which we rely.

The incident commanders in charge of the suppression efforts on the West

Fork Fire—the Nation's highest priority—told me this week that the behavior of the fire is unprecedented. Because of all of the beetle-killed timber, unnaturally dense forest, and dry conditions, the fire has acted in a way that defies computer models and has been incredibly devastating.

The most tragic part of all of this is the occurrence of these forest fires could be reduced, if not outright prevented, with commonsense healthy forest management.

With this in mind, I have put forward the following resolution:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that allocating the appropriate resources to wildland fire management is needed to protect the environment, the economy and the people of the United States, and for other purposes.

Whereas, the thoughts and prayers of the Members of the House of Representatives go out to the individuals and families who have lost loved ones and their homes to wildfire;

Whereas, the Members of the House of Representatives express the utmost gratitude to wildland firefighters and first responders who bravely protect life and property;

Whereas, nearly 10 million acres of land burned in the United States in 2012;

Whereas, the acreage burned by wildfires has steadily increased over the past decade;

Whereas, the most destructive fire in the history of the State of Colorado and the largest fire in the history of the State of New Mexico destroyed hundreds of homes and hundreds of thousands of acres of wildlife habitat in 2012;

Whereas, Federal forest and land management officials continue to request fewer funds to fight wildfires;

Whereas, the funding available for wildland fire suppression in the Wildland Fire Management Account of the Forest Service was cut by \$461 million from fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2013;

Whereas, the Wildland Fire Hazardous Fuels Reduction Account of the Forest Service was cut by \$22 million from fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2013, and the latest budget request asks for another \$116 million decrease;

Whereas, the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program, a program that benefits local economies and improves the overall health of the landscape, has taken a 20 percent cut in funding over the past 2 years;

Whereas, senior Forest Service officials have described a Federal land management system hamstrung by "analysis paralysis;"

Whereas, decades of Federal mismanagement have increased fuel loads on Federal forest land and led to increased risk of catastrophic wildfire;

Whereas, the U.S. Forest Service has replaced responsible, environmentally sound timber thinning with allowing forests to burn through overcrowded forests;

Whereas, the bark beetle epidemic has destroyed 40 million acres of forest in North America; and

Whereas, academic studies indicate that bark beetle-infected trees can still be salvaged for timber to be used in mills and contribute to small businesses and local economies.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

Allocating the appropriate resources to wildland fire management is needed to protect the environment, the economy, and the people of the United States;

The bravery of the men and women who risk their lives to extinguish these conflagrations can never be questioned;

A healthy forest policy must include prescribed thinning;

Funding to fight and prevent wildfires is essential to public safety, environmental protection, and economic growth;

People who live in or near our national forests have a right to expect the greatest possible protection for their homes and properties;

The government should not continue to acquire more land when the hundreds of millions of acres already controlled by the government are mismanaged; and

The Forest Service should proactively manage Federal forest lands in a manner that protects life and property, prevents catastrophic wildfire, promotes forest and watershed health, and creates jobs and economic development in the forest products industry.

I invite all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in standing with the people of Colorado, standing with all in the West who have been impacted by catastrophic wildfire. Join me in thanking the firefighters who are risking their lives to protect others. Join me in the action to prevent future devastation and restore our forests to health.

□ 1030

EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER THE LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Minutes ago, a 5-4 decision, written by Justice Kennedy, ruled that DOMA is a violation of the Equal Protection Clause. Today's decision is a monumental step forward in the long march towards GLBT equality.

Forty years ago, I chaired a committee hearing in the Oregon legislature on discrimination based on sexual orientation. It was an eye-opening experience for me. It was the first time someone ever acknowledged to me their sexual orientation, let alone the discrimination they faced living a life of repression and fear. In the course of those 40 years, it has been a privilege to have been able to help fight to ban discrimination based on sexual orientation.

We have watched a political movement emerge from the ashes of defeat, on discriminatory ballot measures across the country. It's exciting to see how this movement has been led at first by the people in the GLBT community, who refused to accept defeat, who, despite significant personal sacrifice, have stepped forward to declare who they are, who they love, what they want, and why they want it.

It has been encouraging to watch business leaders step forward, no longer just the more progressive elements of the business community. Lately, it has become mainstream to acknowledge that diversity in the workforce demands a nondiscrimination policy—that regardless of a person's sexual orientation and to whom they choose to commit, it makes no

difference in the eyes of a thoughtful, successful employer.

It was exciting for me to watch and to participate in this year's Pride Parade in Portland, to note the leadership of virtually every institution in our community—businesses like Nike and Standard Insurance, Northwest Natural, grocery stores, colleges, hospitals and health professionals, universities, and churches—all marching proudly in a show of solidarity, a rejection of discrimination, support for diversity in the workplace for our friends, neighbors and relatives.

Today's Supreme Court decision marks the most significant milestone yet in this struggle. By striking down DOMA, the Supreme Court has cast aside a major barrier to our GLBT friends, neighbors and relatives to be able to live complete lives—to be able to avoid discrimination, the stigma, the economic disadvantage. It's a signal that this will be the final chapter for a society that recognizes the worth of all human beings, acknowledges the right of all human beings to live as they wish, love who they will and be able to enjoy the multiple benefits that come from being involved in committed relationships and legal marriages.

It's not just a milestone for our brothers and sisters in the GLBT community. It's a significant benefit for all society. If one truly believes that marriage is one of the cornerstones that we encourage for committed relationships, for people to be able to raise their families, look after one another in a stable, committed relationship, why shouldn't they be able to marry? Why should the Federal Government refuse to recognize that and discriminate? Some of the most traditional elements of our society who are dragging their feet should be in the forefront in helping lead this charge.

Now, we must be vigilant. There are still pockets of resistance, hostility, bigotry, and discrimination. There are State laws that need to be adjusted, but it will no longer be sanctioned by Federal policy, and that is the critical difference. Once it is no longer legal to discriminate, we are truly in the home stretch for the type of society we want.

This critical step was a narrow 5-4 decision, but it was a victory nonetheless. The path forward is a little more clear, and it's going to be a little easier. But before we start this next chapter, it's fitting that we celebrate this moment—the accomplishment of what it represents and what it will mean for America.

That temple of justice that is the Supreme Court looks a little different this morning, and I hope Americans will appreciate it and think about where we go from here.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Michael Rucker, Bible Baptist Church, Wichita Falls, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Dear Heavenly Father, we come into Your presence and thank You for all that You have done for this country.

We would ask Your leadership in the decisions that need to be made to keep this country great. Help us to put aside our personal feelings and do what is right for this great Nation and the people of this Nation.

Lord, we would ask You to help all the States that have had catastrophes the past few months. Continue to heal and restore back the things that have been lost or destroyed in these events.

We are so thankful for Your watch care over us. Keep us free from the tyranny of those who want to take our freedom away. Watch over our men and women in the military.

We appreciate the liberty You have so graciously blessed us with. We want to give You all the praise and the honor and the glory, and we thank You for it.

In Jesus' name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND MICHAEL RUCKER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, our guest chaplain today has been the pastor of Bible Baptist Church in Wichita Falls, Texas, for the past 20 years; but his ministry and passion for spreading

the word of God has never been confined to the walls of any church building.

Mike Rucker, known to many as the "Flying Preacher," has been combining his love of auto racing and the ministry since 1985 when he and his wife of 40 years, Sherrie, began Rucker Racing Ministries. Since then, they have traveled to racetracks across the United States, spreading the good word while he races and while Sherrie often sings the national anthem.

Pastor Rucker also serves as the chaplain for the Wichita County Sheriff's Office and for the Wichita Falls Police Department and is a regular on Joe Tom White's "Rise 'n Shine" radio show. In short, he has never been afraid to roll up his sleeves and be in the world while sharing the Gospel with folks across Texas and the Nation.

Pastor Rucker graduated from the Arlington Baptist College in Arlington, Texas. He and Sherrie have two sons, Michael and Matthew, and one daughter, Marlene, and five grandchildren.

I am pleased to help welcome Pastor Rucker, the "Flying Preacher," to the House today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

A WAR ON COAL

(Ms. JENKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JENKINS. Yesterday, the President called for more energy taxes and regulations that will hurt the economy and job creation. One of the President's senior advisers even said, "A war on coal is exactly what's needed."

In my State, where coal supplies nearly 75 percent of the electricity and where coal plants support thousands of jobs, I don't think a war on coal is what Kansans need. Reducing one of the most affordable sources of energy will cause prices to go up, and that makes life harder for people.

The administration needs to stop picking winners and losers. This approach has failed. It has cost taxpayers billions of dollars, and dozens of green energy companies that were offered taxpayer dollars are bankrupt or floundering and are laying off workers.

Instead of favoring special interests, the House plan supports a real all-of-the-above approach to energy that will incentivize job creation, lower energy costs for Americans, and reduce U.S. dependence on foreign oil.

JUSTICE AND EQUITY RESTORED IN AMERICA

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Almost 17 years to the day—that's a long time—the House of Representatives passed the so-called Defense of Marriage Act. At that time, I went to the floor and voted with a small minority against this legislation. I said it was unnecessary, discriminatory, and unconstitutional.

It took 17 years to work through the system and to finally get the Supreme Court to act and to decide that, indeed, the Defense of Marriage Act, so-called, is unconstitutional and is a deprivation of the equal liberty of persons it has protected in the Fifth Amendment:

"The Federal statute is invalid, for no legitimate purpose overcomes the purpose and effect to disparage and injure those whom the State, by its marriage laws, sought to protect in personhood and dignity," as written by Justice Kennedy, "by seeking to displace this protection and treating those persons as living in marriages less respected than others."

Today, the Supreme Court restored justice and equity in America.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT TO FIX STUDENT LOANS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, more than a month ago, the House passed H.R. 1911, a bill based on the President's 2014 budget request, which would provide a market-based interest rate for student loans.

Editorial boards from across the country have lauded this bill and have called on the Senate to act on a similar proposal:

USA Today stated:

Rates on loans are now set by Washington, not markets. Obama and the House Republicans wisely call for a market solution.

The Boston Globe stated:

The solution President Obama and House Republicans have proposed would prevent what has become a frustrating annual standoff.

The Los Angeles Times stated:

Republicans are backing a long-term solution that's similar to one President Obama proposed . . . The Senate should pass its own version . . . then work out the differences with the House.

With less than a week before student loan rates jump from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, the Senate has failed to pass a bill that would address the issue. It's time for the Senate to come to the table.

CANYON MIDDLE SCHOOL—SCHOOL TO WATCH AWARD

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Canyon Middle School in Castro Valley, California, in my congressional district, was recently recognized as one of

the Schools to Watch by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform.

The School to Watch program was launched in 1999 to identify high-performing middle schools that serve as a model for other schools to watch across the Nation. These schools, like Canyon Middle School, demonstrate academic excellence, develop programs that respond to the sensitive needs of early adolescence, and provide students with high-quality teachers and resources to support students in their academic goals.

This week, at the Ninth Annual Schools to Watch Conference, Canyon Middle School will be presented with this prestigious award. Canyon Middle School will be represented by attendance clerk Adria Anderson-Kelly, Assistant Principal Juan Flores, Assistant Principal Annie Flores-Aikey, math and science teacher Gregory Matawaran, math and science teacher Liz Oettel, and special education teacher Cheryll Rosales.

I look forward to congratulating the group from Canyon Middle School this Thursday when they visit my office, and I look forward to hearing more details about how more schools can follow their example of excellence.

Congratulations again to the teachers, administrators, parents, and students that helped Canyon Middle School achieve this award. You make me and your congressional district very proud.

□ 1210

IN MEMORY OF STEVE LAFRANCE

(Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COTTON. Today, I honor the memory of my constituent Steve LaFrance who passed away earlier this month. Steve was a pillar of the Pine Bluff community, and really all of Arkansas.

A pharmacist by training, he started his business in 1968 with a single pharmacy in Gibson's Department Store in Pine Bluff. From that modest start, Steve built USA Drug over 44 years into the largest privately owned chain of drugstores in the country.

Steve's motto, like my own dad's, was "do the right thing." It was the foundation of his success. All who knew him and all who worked with Steve, whether employees, customers, vendors, and even competitors, respected not only his business acumen, but especially his sense of fair play, passion, and loyalty.

Even more than a businessman, though, Steve was a devoted family man, proud father of four children, seven grandkids, and the loving husband of Linda, his wife of 44 years. He was also a deeply faithful Christian man who walked in the path of the Lord and now walks with Him.

On behalf of all Arkansans and the United States Congress, I wish to express my deepest condolences to him.

Like you, we all miss "Big Steve," and we were all enriched by having our lives touched by him.

PROTECTING THE BALLOT BOX FROM DISCRIMINATION

(Mr. BARROW of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment in the Supreme Court's decision striking down the preclearance provisions of the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, making sure that our election laws are fair is the most important job in a democracy because the right to vote is the right on which everything else depends. Countless Americans have marched for it, suffered for it, and shed their blood for it.

In Georgia, one of the greatest proponents of the Voting Rights Act, our colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, knows all too well the price that's been paid to make sure that election laws are not only open but fair to all concerned.

We can't go back to the days when majorities can pass laws that limit or diminish the voting strength of minorities. I'm calling on my colleagues in Congress, Republicans and Democrats, not to let this issue die. We need to do what is right and ensure, once and for all, that folks aren't discriminated against at the ballot box.

SECURING OUR FUTURE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have a plan to create jobs, grow our economy, and secure our future for all Americans. And we're doing it by expanding opportunity, not expanding government.

We're holding government accountable to the hardworking taxpayers of this country.

We're reining in runaway Washington spending that's driving up our national debt.

We're going to reform our Tax Code to make it fairer and simpler for all Americans.

We are promoting an all-of-the-above, all-American energy strategy that will create jobs, lower energy costs, and strengthen our national security.

These are the commonsense solutions that the American people deserve, Mr. Speaker. It's not fair that Washington Democrats keep offering up only more spending and political games. Real solutions to real problems, that's the House Republican commitment.

STUDENT LOANS

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of 7 million students with subsidized student loans to

urge my colleagues in Congress to come together to prevent student loan rates from doubling on July 1.

The cost of a college degree has increased by more than 1,000 percent in the last 30 years. Two-thirds of college seniors who graduated in 2011 had an average student loan debt of \$26,000 per borrower. As the July 1 deadline approaches, America's total student loan debt already tops \$1.1 trillion.

We're a nation that invests in our future, and that means investing in our kids. Mounting student debt is handicapping a generation of graduates who already face a tough job market. This debt is forcing them to put off key milestones like buying a home and starting a family. This delay in the American Dream will diminish our Nation's economic development.

Congress has come to the aid of our banks and worked to promote industry. Now it's time to step up for our students by preserving college affordability and keeping the American Dream within reach.

Let's stand together to keep Federal student loan rates down. I urge my colleagues to act now.

THE WAR ON COAL

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to share a quote with my colleagues to make them aware of this. It is from Daniel Schrag. He is the White House adviser on climate change, and this was reported in The New York Times. Quite frankly, I find this quote baffling. Here it is:

The one thing the President really needs to do now is to begin the process of shutting down the conventional coal plants. Politically, the White House is hesitant to say that we're having a war on coal. On the other hand, a war on coal is exactly what's needed.

That was Mr. Schrag, the White House adviser on climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I highlight this with my colleagues in this House right now because a war on coal is a war on jobs; a war on jobs, is a war on the American worker.

I have never met anybody that wants to pay more for electric power generation, but the actions of this administration, the actions of the President choosing to circumvent Congress and implement these is costing us 500,000 jobs.

PTSD AWARENESS DAY

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I'm rising today to recognize Posttraumatic Stress Awareness Day and so that we can honor our men and women in uniform who have so bravely served our

Nation. For them, when they come home, the battle doesn't end, which is why we must ensure that they're well served as they go through the transition from combat to civilian life.

Research has shown that an estimated 18.5 percent, or nearly one in five of our courageous veterans, suffer from PTSD or depression. This number is likely artificially low because of a reluctance to report these conditions. Further, PTSD and other mental conditions can often lead to other serious psychological and physical health conditions.

In Congress, we must ensure that we work with the Department of Veterans Affairs to address these issues as they face our veterans coming home. We owe it to them, these selfless, servant leaders, to empower them so that they can be provided the seamless transition they need and empower them to continue their service to our communities here at home.

THE WAR ON COAL

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, our President announced his intention to unilaterally disarm our national defense by cutting back our nuclear deterrent. This week, he announced his intention to unilaterally disarm our entire economy by declaring war on coal.

In my State of North Dakota, the coal industry employs over 17,000 highly paid workers that provide the lowest cost electricity to our retail customers anywhere in the country. They contribute \$3.5 billion to our State's economy.

And in case the President thinks that we need his EPA to keep our air clean, he should know that North Dakota meets all ambient air quality standards as prescribed by the EPA.

And I will not sit idly by and watch this President steal the jobs, hopes, and dreams of my constituents, nor will I sit idly by while he and his EPA impose their mediocrity on my State's excellent stewardship of our natural resources.

North Dakota will not retreat from this war waged on us by our President. We must and we will fight back.

DALIP SINGH SAUND

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of Dalip Singh Saund, the first Indian American and the first Asian American to be elected to Congress.

Along with 13 of my colleagues from California, I recently sent a letter asking Governor Jerry Brown to induct him into California's Hall of Fame.

Saund was born in a small village in India, and much like my own parents,

he immigrated to the United States in 1920 to attend college in California. He went on to serve his adopted country for three terms in Congress and was a trailblazer for human and civil rights.

Congressman Saund's outstanding achievements and public service are an inspiration to generations of Asian Americans, Californians, and to all Americans.

His portrait now hangs right outside this Chamber as a reminder to us all of the values that he stood for, values of equality and opportunity. Now it's time that Congressman Dalip Singh Saund's contributions are recognized in his home State by enshrining him in California's Hall of Fame.

□ 1220

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, this morning in striking down the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act, the Supreme Court stood for an idea that permeates this institution: that regardless of who you are, the color of your skin, or whom you choose to love, the United States will not discriminate against you.

Unfortunately, yesterday the Supreme Court went in exactly the wrong direction on an even more fundamental issue: that those of us who serve here, our laws, our President, our Members of Congress, are elected by the people of the United States in a truly equal fashion.

We acknowledge that progress has been made in those regions that historically discriminated against minorities, but we also acknowledge that the problem is still there. Justice Ginsburg's dissenting opinion has example after example of discrimination. For example, in 2004, Waller County, Texas, threatened to prosecute two black students after they announced their intention to run for office.

Mr. Speaker, business should cease on this floor until we take up the Supreme Court's challenge to modernize and reinstitute the heart of the Voting Rights Act so that we can all look each other in the eye and say, We are here because the American people, all of them, elected us.

DEEPER AND BIGGER HOLE OF DEBT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in just 4 days, millions of American students will quite suddenly finally find themselves between a rock and a hard place. Unless Congress acts, the interest rates on subsidized student loans will double on July 1. This increase comes on top of sharp rises in public college tuition,

and together means students hoping to improve their economic chances in life have to borrow more money at higher cost to get an increasingly more expensive college education.

A new report by the Joint Economic Committee, on which I serve as the ranking Democrat on the House side, shows that two-thirds of our recent graduates now have student loan debt with an average balance of \$27,000. For someone just starting out in life, that is a mountain of debt and averages about 60 percent of their annual earnings. That means that two-thirds of our college graduates today are starting out in a pretty deep, big hole.

The question for Congress is: Are we going to just sit back and let them get into a deeper and bigger hole of debt?

Let's fix the student loan problem and get America moving again.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it took the Supreme Court to remind us that when our young people put their bodies in harm's way, or even offer their lives for this great country, that notwithstanding their background, they don't do it for their color, for their race, for their family and community alone; they do it for these great United States. People who have never met each other but do feel that under our Constitution we are all brought together to respect each other's rights, and we have an outline for that belief that is called our Constitution.

It seems to me that yesterday the Supreme Court said that we are making progress in making certain that all Americans have the right to vote and that Negroes, as they were called in 1965, have made great progress. But that was not what Lyndon Johnson said when he was advocating the 1965 Civil Rights Act. He said that no impediment should be put in the way of any person being denied the right to vote because of their race or color. I hope the Supreme Court will review this ruling.

STANDING UP FOR WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE CHOICES

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Texas State Senator Wendy Davis from my home town of Fort Worth, Texas, for leading a marathon filibuster in standing up for women and women's rights. For too long, we have seen the health care choices of women taken over by male politicians who are more concerned

with furthering an ideology than advancing women's health. Instead of listening to women, male dominance over women's health care decisions has drowned out the most important voice of all—the women who face their own reproductive health care choices.

I believe reproductive choices are deeply personal in nature and should rest with the woman. I believe we should promote education, counseling, and provide women with the support services they need, not restrict their medical choices.

Thank you, Senator Wendy Davis, who stood up for Texas women across the State. The voices of women were heard all over the country in this debate last night in the Texas Legislature, and Senator Davis fought hard and fought back against any efforts to greatly reduce and restrict women's health care. And she won.

Thank you, Senator Davis, for your courageous fight and well-deserved victory. Our fight to protect women's health care is not over, and I look forward to fighting with you, a strong Texas woman.

CONGRATULATING FREIHOFFER'S BAKING COMPANY

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Freihofer's Baking Company as it celebrates 100 years in business in New York's capital region.

After a century of contributing to the local economy, Freihofer's plans to mark this milestone by continuing to give back to our community. Over the next year, the Albany-based baking company will give away up to 40,000 loaves of bread to consumers and charitable organizations.

What makes Freihofer's a remarkable company is quite simple: its people. At every level, the good work done by the Freihofer's team makes us all proud, and that is why I am on this floor speaking today.

Freihofer's has always focused on how best to serve our community. On June 1, the organization celebrated its 35th anniversary of the Freihofer's Run for Women, one of the largest and most prestigious all-female 5K road races, which stresses community health and involvement.

In New York, we are proud to count Freihofer's among our many successful businesses that boost our community pride just as much as local economic development. I congratulate Freihofer's Baking Company on its first century of success and wish them many, many more years of fine baking to come.

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's now been 906 days since I arrived in Congress, and the Republican leadership has still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis. Thirty-seven percent of unemployed Americans have been without work for more than 6 months. That's 4.4 million people who haven't worked for at least a half year.

Take a moment to imagine life without a job for 6 months. Imagine depleting your retirement savings to pay for your family's food and shelter. Imagine the pain of facing rejection again and again. As researchers around the Nation have demonstrated, employers simply do not want to hire the long-term unemployed. There's a stigma workers just can't shake.

It's up to Congress to take action. It's time for us to focus on retraining and reemployment programs to ensure that we stop the establishment of a permanent underclass in America. The mantra of this Congress should be jobs, jobs, jobs.

OPPORTUNITIES AT INTERSECTION OF INNOVATION

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I hosted Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI for a roundtable discussion at America's number one art and design school, the Rhode Island School of Design. It focused on creating jobs and the opportunities that exist at the intersection of innovation, technology, and design.

Rhode Island is the birthplace of the American industrial revolution. We know, on a level playing field, American workers can compete against any international competitor, and that's why it's so critical that our country begin taking concrete steps to leverage these new opportunities.

First, we need to better integrate curriculums on science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and art and design. Secondly, we need to think about using new tools, such as my Make It in American Manufacturing Act, to create manufacturing and innovation jobs right here in America, especially with the emerging opportunities in advanced manufacturing and 3-D printing.

Finally, we need to ensure that innovators and entrepreneurs have access to the capital they need to pursue their ideas without obstacles.

I will continue working with my colleagues to make these goals a reality and keep our country at the cutting edge of innovation, technology, and design.

□ 1230

FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN RATES

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission

to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to address the increase in student loans that is about to happen this week. If we do not do something by July 1, the interest rate on student loans, which has been at 3.4 percent, will double to 6.8 percent.

Now, last year we were able to come together and make an accord and make it easier for our students to gulp and take those loans out so that they could go and get an education.

Getting an education, teaching our young people science, technology, engineering, mathematics, the arts, music, et cetera, is of national security interest to this Nation. Even Secretary Gates said the number one issue is for our people to be educated.

So we must show our students that we care about them, and that they too have a future in this Nation. I urge my colleagues to come together to do something about the student loans.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, with just 5 days left until the student loan interest rates double, Congress must act now. If we do not, student loan interest rates will double overnight from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

This will increase the cost of college for more than seven million students across this Nation and on the central coast of California, adding thousands of dollars to a student's college bill. And this will not only saddle students with more debt, but it will hinder our growing economy.

At a time when the cost of college continues to rise, we must do all that we can to make college as affordable as possible for as many students as possible. We must keep open the doors of opportunity for all and, in the process, produce a well-educated workforce that will grow our economy.

That's why I'm a proud supporter of legislation to keep the student rates at a low 3.4 percent. This legislation should be brought to this House floor for a vote immediately.

Mr. Speaker, interest rates in other sectors remain low to help grow the economy. Why shouldn't they remain low for our students?

They are our future.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1613, OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2231, OFFSHORE ENERGY AND JOBS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2410, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JUNE 20, 2013, THROUGH JULY 5, 2013; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 274 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 274

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1613) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Grayson of Florida or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee

on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-16. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2410) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: section 717; section 718; the words "or any other" on page 64, line 13; the words "or any other" on page 65, line 9; and section 740. Where points of order are waived against part of a section, points of order against a provision in another part of such section may be made only against such provision and not against the entire section. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from June 29, 2013, through July 5, 2013—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 6. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July.

SEC. 7. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 6 p.m. on Wednesday, July 3, 2013, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1240

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to our good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who I certainly hope is feeling better than the way he's walking today, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. This resolution provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act of 2013, as well as H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, and makes several specific amendments in order to each bill which are germane and compliant with the rules of the House. This proposed rule also provides for an open rule for consideration of H.R. 2410, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies bill.

These energy bills, if enacted, will help foster responsible development of our abundant offshore domestic energy resources and will do so in an environmentally responsible manner. H.R. 2231 would help reverse some of the current administration's energy policies, which are stalling responsible offshore lease development on the Outer Continental Shelf. This legislation would require that the administration implement a new 5-year leasing plan, including 50 percent of the areas that have been previously identified as the most promising in oil reserves and natural gas.

The average American consumer has seen their energy bill double since this

administration started. A gallon of gas was under \$2 when the President was first sworn in. It's now routinely more than \$4 a gallon—and continues to climb. And yet the administration deliberately stalls and blocks job-creating, energy-producing projects like the Keystone pipeline for the responsible development of coal and tar sands reserves we have on our public lands, including in my own State. This actually hits the middle class and the poor class the worst.

H.R. 2231 will streamline the current bureaucracy handling these leases and will also implement a fair and equitable revenue-sharing plan for coastal States. The Congressional Budget Office has indicated that passage of this bill will reduce net direct spending of the Federal Government by \$1.5 billion over the next 10 years. So, in essence, you have a bill that makes us more energy independent, drives down the cost of fuel for U.S. families, helps reduce the cost of the Federal Government, and produces an estimated 1.2 million jobs. I think, by most standards, that would be considered a fairly good bill.

Likewise, the other bill in the rule, H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, will provide for improved Federal management and oversight of energy resources which straddle international boundaries. Passage of this act will implement an agreement we already have with the Government of Mexico on how to handle development of these resources, including revenue-sharing concepts, as well as ensuring that the United States companies that are investing will develop their resources but not be imperiled by actions that may be taken later on by the Government.

Finally, the resolution also provides for a modified open rule for consideration of H.R. 2410, the fiscal year 2014 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies appropriations bill, which continues what was common when I first arrived here and then stopped but was then reinstated and continues to be reinstated by Chairman PETE SESSIONS—having open rules on our appropriations bills.

I'm appreciative of the Rules Committee chairman's leadership in this regard. I'm also appreciative of the hard work and dedication of the bill's sponsors. First, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Washington, also chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee (Mr. HASTINGS), as well as the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), for his leadership on the Agriculture appropriation bill. In short, this is a fair and good rule dealing with good pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, these are good bills. I urge their adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Utah, my friend (Mr. BISHOP), for yielding the customary 30 minutes to me.

This rule provides for the consideration of three bills, as enunciated by my friend from Utah. However, the only thing that these bills have in common is that they're overwhelmingly partisan in nature and fail to address the most pressing challenges facing our country. Bottom line: we should be doing all that we can to help struggling Americans get back on their feet.

The first bill, H.R. 1613, had been relatively noncontroversial and could have been addressed under suspension. But instead, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to take the partisan route by including a provision that waives the Securities and Exchange Commission natural resources extraction disclosure rule of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, which requires the disclosure of payments from oil and gas companies to foreign governments. I just simply don't understand why this poison pill was added.

Similarly, H.R. 2231 opens up new, unsafe drilling off the coasts of 14 States at a time when domestic energy production is booming. Furthermore, the bill does virtually nothing—and I asked that question of our colleague, Mr. DUNCAN from South Carolina—to implement key safety reforms in the wake of the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster and constrains the statutory review process for offshore drilling.

This is a part of the Republicans' "drill, baby, drill" energy policy agenda. While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to bring bills like this to the floor which contain huge giveaways to Big Oil, it is clear that they're not interested in doing a thing to protect worker safety, the environment, or the tourism and fishing industries. It is astounding that Congress would move forward to open new natural gas and oil leases when this institution has not acted on the recommendation to improve the safety of offshore drilling. If we didn't learn anything at all from BP, we're not ever going to learn anything. The successor to the BP spill commission recently gave Congress a D-plus grade on its legislative response to the spill.

Before opening any new leases, we should enact legislation to improve safety and eliminate or adjust the liability caps upward. We have a pitiable liability cap now of \$75 million.

It is time to get real about energy policy. We need to invest in the development of renewable resources, which would reduce our impact on climate change and move us towards true energy independence. These two bills today aren't about gas prices or job creation. They're about bolstering the Republicans' political base and lining the pockets of Big Oil and gas CEOs.

Republicans' refusal to address the sequester and insistence upon limited cuts in the Homeland Security, MilCon/VA, and DOD appropriations bills leave all the other nondefense measures like H.R. 2410 before us today with inad-

equated funding levels. The refusal by my friends on the other side to appoint conferees to reach a bipartisan compromise on the budget and end the sequester has left us with this disastrous agriculture bill that we saw last week. As my Republican colleagues very well know, there are \$214 million in cuts to Women, Infants, and Children, or WIC, funding, which will prevent 214,000 eligible applicants from receiving the nutrition they need.

□ 1250

Furthermore, there are \$284 million in cuts to Food for Peace that will result in 7.4 million fewer people receiving food aid from the United States. Mr. Speaker, I'd really laugh, except the prioritization of partisanship and politics over responsibility has become par for the course in the Republican-controlled Congress.

As I pointed out before, just last week the Republican partisan farm bill was scuttled. Traditionally—I'm here now 21 years, and that bill, at times that it was brought appropriately, was a bipartisan piece of legislation. Draconian cuts and work requirements imposed upon programs that benefit the poorest among us effectively killed any chance of the FARRM Bill passing. Rather than see passage of a strong, bipartisan bill, Republicans deliberately made it unpalatable to even strong agriculture supporters like myself. These are not the priorities of a Nation that cares about its poor. These are the priorities of a Republican Party that cares only about itself.

The poor are not villains. Many are trapped in inescapable situations due to circumstances totally beyond their control and largely, in many instances, by our making here in this institution. Mr. Speaker, it's hard to pull yourself up by your bootstraps when those bootstraps, without any nourishment, may be the only thing you have to eat.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the author of one of the bills in here, as well as the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding time, and I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation covered by the rule.

Mr. Speaker, in our country today, millions of Americans continue to search for work, the national average price of gasoline is \$3.50, and rising costs of everything from electricity to food to health care makes it tough for families and small businesses to make ends meet. But instead of providing relief for struggling Americans, President Obama yesterday announced a plan that will inflict further pain and cause further damage to our struggling economy.

The President's latest attempt to unilaterally impose a national energy tax will cost American jobs and will increase energy prices. Now, in stark

contrast to that, Mr. Speaker, Republicans are advancing solutions to expand access to affordable energy in order to create jobs and to lower energy costs. The bills the House is considering this week are necessary because of the Obama administration's persistent and destructive attacks on American energy production. The President's latest efforts to impose new energy taxes and government red tape follow 4.5 years of erecting American energy roadblocks.

H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, will unlock our offshore energy resources that are being held captive by this administration. The differences are clear between the President's current no-new-drilling-and-no-new-jobs plan and the Republican pro-energy, pro-jobs offshore drilling plan. The President's 5-year current offshore leasing plan keeps 85 percent of offshore areas under lock and key—Mr. Speaker, keeps 85 percent under lock and key—effectively reinstating the moratoria that were lifted right before he took office.

The Republican drill-smart plan would open new areas containing the most oil and natural gas resources, allowing for new energy production in parts of the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts. The President's plan refuses even to let Virginia develop its offshore resources until after 2017 and cancels a lease sale that would have allowed them to go offshore 2 years ago.

The Republican plan supports the bipartisan wishes of the Virginia Governor, the congressional delegation, and the public by requiring an offshore lease sale to be held.

The President's plan suppresses American job creation and economic growth. Our plan, Mr. Speaker, in contrast, would create 1.2 million jobs long term and would generate \$1.5 billion in new revenue. This Republican approach is exactly what our country and our economy needs right now.

We can do better than what the President outlined yesterday that stifles American energy production and raises energy costs.

I urge adoption of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would say to my very good friend and namesake, if you can do better, do it.

I'm very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN) with whom I serve on the Rules Committee.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last week, the FARRM Bill failed. It failed in large part because of Republicans' nasty attacks on America's nutrition and anti-hunger programs.

Notwithstanding the experience of last week, in this rule the House is considering debating the agriculture appropriations bill, a bill that not only underfunds the WIC program, but actually makes it more difficult for low-income women to receive breastfeeding counseling.

Mr. Speaker, it's as if the Republican leadership hasn't learned from its mistakes. WIC is a critical program that provides food and nutrition counseling for low-income, pregnant and breastfeeding women, as well as for newborns and infants. It is an important and successful program. It is a key program that helps pregnant and breastfeeding women stay healthy through proper nutrition and actually helps prevent many health issues associated with poor nutrition.

Despite the program's 39-year successful track record, the Republicans decided to include WIC in their sequester plan. Unlike SNAP—which, thankfully, was excluded from the sequester and every single major deficit reduction plan—the WIC program was subjected to the sequester. And the FY 2014 agriculture appropriations bill includes a major cut to the WIC program.

The cuts to WIC in this bill could result in over 200,000 pregnant mothers and infants losing access to nutritious food. And tapping into the reserve fund isn't going to cover everyone; 55,000 moms and kids will go without the nutrition that they need.

And WIC is so severely underfunded that the breastfeeding counseling program—a cornerstone of this program—is zeroed out. I guess I shouldn't be surprised that this House of Representatives would promote such anti-women, anti-mother, anti-child legislation. After all, this is the same House that allowed an all-male Republican majority in the Judiciary Committee to write and promote legislation that attacked a woman's right to choose. And by the way, President Obama is threatening a veto of the agriculture appropriations bill in large part because of these draconian cuts. I would say to my Republican friends: stop your assault against poor people in this country.

Now, this agriculture appropriations bill would be bad enough on its own. It would be better if the Appropriations Committee would redraft the bill at pre-sequester funding levels so we're not forced to choose between programs like food safety and WIC, for example.

But what is particularly egregious about this rule that we're considering is what is not included. What's not included is a fix to the upcoming doubling of the student loan interest rates. Congress is going to leave for the 4th of July recess on Friday; yet interest rates are scheduled to double if Congress doesn't act before July 1.

We need an immediate fix to this problem; but instead of working to prevent penalizing millions of students who are looking for help paying for college, the Republican leadership is forcing the House to debate tired, rehashed bills like offshore drilling expansion that have no chance of becoming law. Instead of pushing legislation that helps banks and lenders make even more money, we ought to help the middle class, we ought to help our students.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the comments that were just made by the gentleman from Massachusetts about a program which does fund \$6.7 billion in the WIC program and was passed unanimously by voice vote from both parties in the Appropriations Committee.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the sponsor of one of the bills that is part of this rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I rise today in support of two of the bills that are under this rule, H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, and H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. Both these bills do three things—they provide for jobs; they provide for energy security; and they provide for national security.

Let's put Americans to work harvesting the resources that we have here in this country, and let's meet our energy needs. Because as Admiral Mullen said, there can be no national security without energy security. Let me repeat that: there can be no national security without energy security.

□ 1300

Let's open up these offshore areas that we have resources under and let's produce American energy here at home, putting Americans to work to provide for our energy needs.

I specifically rise to talk about H.R. 1613, which implements the Obama administration's own agreement, an agreement signed in Los Cabos by Secretary Clinton and Foreign Minister Espinosa from Mexico that says: Do you know what? There are resources under that shared boundary out in the Gulf of Mexico, the boundary shared between the United States and the country of Mexico; resources that can be explored and produced to meet our energy needs here at home working with our southern neighbor—Mexico—to share those resources and share the revenues.

Let's do it the right way. Let's do it with the American safety standards and American environmental standards that currently apply to American energy companies producing in the Gulf of Mexico. Let's require those Mexican companies to comply with those standards and then let's share those revenues. This is the right thing.

H.R. 1613 will implement that agreement, but it will do something else. It will remove the uncertainty and provide for American competitiveness when you're competing with foreign countries such as Mexico. This is the right thing for America. Put Americans to work, meet energy needs, and meet our national security needs. That's why House Republicans have focused on an all-of-the-above American energy strategy, and these bills are part of that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill.

The so-called Offshore Energy and Jobs Act is nothing more than another old idea that will not become law. We have voted on a form of this legislation every year since the majority has been in control of this House, yet the same thing happens every time: it goes absolutely nowhere. Instead of working on new, more sustainable energy ideas, we find ourselves here yet again wasting our time on another misguided, destructive, and unnecessary drilling bill.

I'm particularly dismayed that the bill, yet again, expands drilling in areas where voters have unequivocally said they don't want it. The devastating 1969 oil spill in Santa Barbara, California, galvanized our State against any more offshore drilling. That's why California permanently banned new oil and gas leasing in the State waters they control in 1994.

This majority here, which gives lip service to respecting states' rights, has chosen, yet again, to override the will of voters in my district and my State by mandating immediate oil and gas lease sales off the coasts of Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, despite our well-known, long-standing bipartisan opposition.

Later this week, I will be offering an amendment to strike these provisions, and I appreciate the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order. But expansion of drilling in southern California only scratches the surface of what's wrong with this bill. Simply put, it's a solution without a problem.

Drilling, both onshore and offshore, has been expanding rapidly in recent years, and is showing no signs of slowing down. Last year, domestic offshore oil production was higher than it was at the end of the Bush administration. Oil production in the United States increased more last year than at any point since the inception of the oil industry in 1859.

The Obama administration has offered, and continues to offer, millions of acres of public lands offshore for oil and gas exploration and production.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CAPPS. Yet, despite this expansion under the Obama administration, nearly 85 percent of the offshore acreage already under lease by the oil industry is not producing. Instead of recycling bad ideas and expanding drilling in areas where voters don't want it, we should be working together on a responsible, clean energy policy for the 21st century. This bill is just more of the same dirty energy policies of the past.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and reject the underlying bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will have a lot to say about the deficiencies to these two bills over the next 2 days. But today the Republicans are purporting two things: lower gas prices and reduce the deficit. They would have us believe this bill would do that. They're saying high gas prices are due to the fact there's not enough offshore oil drilling.

Nothing could be further from the truth. There's actually a glut of oil in the Gulf region. It's all waiting in storage because, oh, the refineries are doing routine maintenance. Why are they doing that? Well, because it's the height of the driving season for the American people, therefore, they can gouge the consumers by pretending, oh, there's just no other time we could clean the refinery. It doesn't have anything to do with oil supplies. It has to do with a lack of refining capacity artificially manipulated and speculation on Wall Street.

Secondly, they say they're addressing the deficit, that this is going to provide additional revenues in the future. In fact, they are so concerned about the deficit they would not allow an amendment I attempted to offer, supported by a number of west coast Members—three Governors of the Western United States—that would have protected the west coast from the mandatory drilling in this bill. They said that might preclude future revenue from future leases that might be let by a future President, and they said we might not get \$1 billion 30 years in the future because of your amendment.

However, there is an amendment by the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative CASSIDY, who will mandate a diversion of \$500 million a year of revenues flowing to the Treasury to the Gulf States for the next 30 years. Yes, we are going to forego or give up \$15 billion of revenues to the Treasury, creating \$15 billion more debt and deficit for the American people, but they waived the rules. That doesn't count.

This all kind of reminds me a little bit of George Orwell, the way the Republicans cynically manipulate the rules around here. As he said: "All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others."

So Republican amendments that create debt and deficit are exempt from the rules, and Democratic amendments to protect the west coast, which does not want this mandatory oil drilling, because it might forego some potential possible future revenues, are not made in order. This is not for real. This is not an honest process.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is wonderful to realize how the GAO's and the OMB's facts are not inaccurate and also how rules that were waived for this bill have been waived for the same reason in prior pieces of legislation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this rule that would allow the House to hold a vote on the Student Loan Relief Act. If Congress doesn't act by July 1, undergraduate students in this Nation, all over this Nation, will see a hike in their student loan interest rates.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the remarks by the gentleman from Florida that we would have an opportunity to vote on the student loan bill to make sure that we don't do what millions of American students and their families have asked us not to do, and that is, they don't want us to double their debt. But in less than 100 hours if we don't get the vote that Mr. HASTINGS is talking about, in less than 100 hours, millions of American college students may see their student debt increase because of the Republican obstructionism. It's unfortunate that it's come to this. This issue shouldn't be partisan. It's about doing the right thing on behalf of millions of students and their families all across the country.

It's a simple choice. We can help students achieve an education, one that they can afford, and the skills that they need to be successful, or we can put more hurdles in their way and increase the already skyrocketing debt burden that students absorb as they graduate from college.

□ 1310

It has been more than a year of ignoring this issue. A year ago, we were in this position, and a year ago, we voted to keep the student loan rate at 3.75 percent. Nothing has been done until recently, and then the Republicans came up with an idea that was really bad. It was worse than doubling the interest rates on July 1. It was more expensive to the students than doubling the interest rates. It's not a smart solution. It's a terrible solution—it's terrible for students; it's terrible for their families.

After a year of ignoring this issue, the Republicans foisted this harmful idea onto the House floor, and when the Republican bill hit the floor, they refused to allow a vote on a rational plan, like the Courtney bill, that stops this doubling of the interest rates and allows this Congress to examine and develop a long-term solution as part of the Higher Education Reauthorization Act.

Despite trumpeting that their plan was the same as President Obama's proposal, when the Democrats offered President Obama's actual plan, they blocked that vote, too. So they won't keep the interest rates from doubling,

and they won't do a plan that they said is just like theirs. On July 1, those interest rates are going to double on millions of students as they start this school year in August and September.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. The time for obstruction has passed. It's time to keep the rates low and to work on a long-term solution. It's time to stop asking college students and their families to bear an unfair burden of paying down the Bush deficits.

The Democrats have chosen to stand with the students and families who are trying to access the American Dream. We can do this. Millions of families and students have asked us: don't double their debt. Yet, on July 1, because of the Republican obstructionism, that's what's going to happen to these students. It's very unfortunate. It adds an additional \$1,000 to the 4 years of college. We should not do that at this time, in this economy, for these students and families.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself 1 minute.

I appreciate what has been said even though it has very little to do with the bills that we will be discussing in these next couple of weeks.

Especially as a former teacher, I understand significantly what it does to student loans and situations. I understand significantly how now 5 years ago Congress passed legislation that cut out the FFEL Program, which actually helped kids in their being able to afford their college workability. We consolidated all of our efforts with a program, an idea, from the 1980s, which was a bad idea then and is a bad idea now.

Unfortunately, this House has dealt with this issue. On May 23 of this year, we passed a bill that solves this problem, and we sent it over to the Senate. For some reason, I feel uncomfortable or at least tired of being held accountable for the Senate's inability to actually deal with legislation sent to them that solves problems and then have to take the responsibility back here. The House has dealt with this issue, and we did it in a responsible, reasonable way. The Senate has refused to.

So often what we have found as gridlock here is not necessarily between Republicans and Democrats as we pass a whole lot of bipartisan bills on this floor. It's between the Senate and the House. I wish it were different and that we could compel the Senate to act responsibly, but the Senate has not and the House has.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. I do appreciate the gentleman for yielding to me.

I rise to actually speak about an issue that I think we should be addressing today and at this very moment.

With student loan interest rates set to rise in only 5 short days, the time to act is now. It is unacceptable that we have not yet brought up a bill for a vote that can be passed by both Chambers and signed into law.

With tuition rising rapidly and with far too many families and students struggling to make ends meet, middle class families are finding it more and more difficult to pay for college. When I'm home each weekend in Iowa, I hear from countless students and parents who cannot understand why we can't seem to get this done.

This should not be a partisan issue. We need to address student loan debt in the interest of our economy. We must prepare our students for the kind of good-paying middle class jobs that will drive our economy forward, and we must do so in a way that does not saddle them with a lifetime of debt, which prevents them from fully participating in the economy.

I could not have gone to college and would not be where I am today without low-interest student loans and other financial assistance programs that were available to me. It's critical that we get this done now. I am willing to stay here and work until we get this done. We cannot allow the House to recess and leave our students in the dust to face this rate hike.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to a friend of mine, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, as the chart next to me clearly states, we are now 4 days and counting until, by law, the interest rate for the subsidized Stafford student loan program will double—from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. The real chart should probably be 3 days because that's how many legislative days the House and the Senate are in session. Incredibly, we are debating issues which hardly have the same time sensitivity and which clearly are tone deaf to what American families all over the country are really concerned about.

There are 7.5 million college students who use the subsidized Stafford student loan program. They are going to see their rates double. The total gross cost in terms of added interest is about \$4 billion. This is at a time when student loan debt is \$1.1 trillion—higher than credit card debt, higher than car loan debt. Incredibly, this deadline is just being completely ignored by the majority despite the fact that millions of students are making life decisions as we speak as they begin to enroll for next fall's semester.

The bill which the House majority passed on May 23 is a bill which tied rates on a variable basis to Treasury notes, which, by the way, have been

going up like crazy over the last 3 weeks and which the Congressional Budget Office has now analyzed and told us will result in debt costs that will be worse than if Congress did nothing and allowed the rates to double to 6.8 percent.

The solution is obvious. Extend the lower rate, 3.4 percent. My bill, H.R. 1595, which is the subject of the previous question, has 195 signatories for a discharge petition. A substantial group of Members in the House is ready and poised to move. It did get 51 votes in the Senate. It did actually move in the Senate, and the President has said he will sign it. If there is any path forward for those 7.5 million students, it's H.R. 1595. Let's do it. Let's act. Let's turn this countdown clock off. Let's help America's young students afford and pay for a critical need for their future—higher education.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would inform my colleague from Utah that I have no further requests for time, and I would ask whether or not he has additional speakers.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Other than brilliant verbiage from myself, you've got it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am looking forward to the brilliant verbiage.

Following on from the previous discussion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment, which has been discussed, in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I am tempted to take the 8½ minutes and, perhaps, not offer as much brilliant verbiage but at least add, without hyperbole, the continuing concern that all of us should have.

I agree with my friend from Utah when he points to the fact that there has been legislation that has come out of the House of Representatives, regardless of who was in the majority, and that it has gone over to the other body and nothing has transpired. But when the American people look at Congress, they are not looking just at the House of Representatives or just at the United States Senate—it is all of us—and it is our responsibility here in the House, particularly as the body that has the Ways and Means Committee, which generates the financial circumstances of this country that ultimately is voted on.

□ 1320

It's our responsibility, in my judgment, to undertake to answer one simple question regarding this loan thing:

Why is it that college students are going to be required to have loan obligations that raise their loans from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent when Bank X and Bank Y can borrow money from each other for little or nothing at all? That does not make any sense.

We can't do these children this way in this country, and we have an absolute responsibility to all of them to give them the opportunities that many of us had. People here in this House that have come here by way of student loans and some of them have had those opportunities, why not give these children that chance?

Mr. Speaker, the most common critiques of this Congress have been bipartisanship and dysfunction. This rule today for these three bills shows that the Speaker and majority leader are perfectly content with that characterization of their work. Congress doesn't have to be this way.

It isn't always like this. It wasn't like this when I came here in 1992. It was not like this for the greater portion of a decade after I came here in 1992. Instead of appointing budget conferees, instead of passing a farm bill in a bipartisan way, instead of fixing the pending student loan interest rate, instead of replacing the sequester that has been monstrosity all over this Nation hindering our economic recovery and instead of preventing us from yet another game of chicken, which we will be doing sometime in the fall over the debt ceiling, we're considering three purely political bills that will only create more partisanship among us and might, I add, ain't going nowhere.

Mr. Speaker, Congress can and must do better.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the opportunity of being part of a debate that covered a smorgasbord of ideas. Let me just respond to several of those that have been presented in the last lead-up to the vote on this particular amendment.

As I said before, I'm a teacher. I care greatly about education. I'm especially frustrated with the way Congress has passed or handled the student loan provision.

Several years ago, while the Democrats were in control—I'm trying not to be too partisan, but they were in control—we changed the law that dealt with student loans to consolidate that authority within the Federal Government. By doing so, we crushed private-State partnership plans that were an excellent avenue for loans that students could use. They could get breaks depending on their repayment habits. It was a marvelous program, but it was stopped in an effort to try to consolidate everything here within Congress. Since that time, we have played silly games of brinksmanship that deal with what the rate should be and what the rate might be.

We have a bill that this body passed on May 23 in plenty of time to extinguish this issue, plenty of time for the Senate to debate it, amend it, send it back to us, appoint the conference, go through regular process, if the Senate wished to do that. Instead, the result is the Senate has basically turned their back on the issue and said, We'll let it go over the cliff one more time.

You see, it shouldn't have been that way. If we had not changed the policy back when we passed a bill in the previous leadership of this House, we wouldn't have had this problem in the first place. What this House tried to do is say this is a silly approach going into the future. Let's come up with a policy towards student loans. If we have to consolidate them, if the Federal Government has to have their control and grasp over the entire thing, we should do it in a way that provides some kind of flexibility and some kind of rationalization so it can ebb and flow in the future as the market requires it to do.

We passed a bill not just that allowed them not to double, but we passed a bill here on this floor which solved the problem. The fact that the Senate does not wish to solve the problem is something that I find sad. But we solved the problem, and we did it in a timely fashion.

The great speeches that I heard today—and they were very good and their verbiage was better than mine—should be given over in the Senate where it can do some good.

I also want to talk about a couple of other issues that I've heard, that these particular bills in this rule would violate states rights' agreements, even though the issue at hand is only those waters and coastal waters that are a part of the Federal preserve and does not talk about State waters whatsoever.

We talked about in H.R. 1613 a poison pill being inserted into that provision that exempts Dodd-Frank. Somehow I wish we could actually go back to the person who actually inserted that provision in there because it was Secretary Hillary Clinton. That's part of the negotiations we did as a country with the Mexican Government; and it's logical that it is in there because it gives some protection to U.S. companies that, if that language was not in there, could be forced either to violate Federal laws or violate foreign laws and face civil penalties or cease to operate in foreign countries.

I can understand why the Secretary of State at the time did negotiate that portion that is in there. That's not the poison pill. That's simply what is in the negotiated settlement. All we're doing with this bill is enacting it, putting it into place, and allowing us to move forward with what has been simply negotiated on resource areas that straddle international lines.

I'm also somewhat frustrated with the statement that we might as well use the leases that we currently have.

I'm also frustrated because we have had a great deal of increase in production of oil and gas, and it's all happened on private and State lands.

I happen to represent a State that has almost 70 percent of it controlled by the Federal Government. I have enormous amounts of resource potential in my State, but it is controlled by the Federal Government. So even though areas where private property and States have been able to increase the revenue to their States and increase the total amount of petroleum productions that we have, my State has seen the exact opposite.

If you go onshore to the areas that are controlled by this administration, the Federal lands, the amount of parcels that have been offered since 2005 are down 88 percent. The amount of acres that are offered for development of resources are down 85 percent. And what is most sad is the amount of revenue that is produced both to the State and to the Federal Government from onshore development since 2005, which is down 99 percent.

A lease is simply not, as has been stated, the green light to start drilling. A release simply says you start the process. And part of the problem with the releases both onshore and offshore has been the inability of the Federal Government to do so in a reasonable fashion. On onshore lease development there is regulation that says it must be done in a 6-month period of time to move forward from the initial sale and to which the lease is then offered so the company can start its drilling process. Yet in a survey done by GAO, 91 percent of the time, that 6-month standard has not been met onshore.

Part of H.R. 2231 is a reorganization of the administrative function that deals with how these leases are developed and how they proceed going forward. By taking one agency, which has had a very poor record and dividing it into three with specific responsibilities, we think we can streamline this process and make sure that what we are doing on the Outer Continental Shelf is far more effective than what we are doing on Federal lands onshore, where all we are having is stalling delays and a lack of production and a lack of revenue coming from them.

It was once said to the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee that if he had a better idea, do it. In all due respect, he has a better idea. That better idea is the two bills before us right now, H.R. 2231, and the other bill, which is H.R. 1613. Those are good ideas. They will move us forward. They're the things we ought to do to prepare.

I think it's a great rule that is allowing that and allowing the appropriation bill to come through in an open rule, allowing anyone who has an idea that he or she wishes to bring to the floor the opportunity to do so.

With that, this is a fair rule. It deals with an appropriations process, as well as two bills that are good bills that

will help people. Especially after yesterday's speech, we should have an energy policy in this country aimed at helping middle class Americans, not one that simply says, freeze in the dark, especially if you're poor. That's the best thing we are going to be able to do.

□ 1330

These bills move us forward. We should vote for them. With that, having failed at my effort to give you good verbiage, in which case I'm sorry you're holding the cane there, I hope you're using that only to navigate around this floor and it will not become a weapon in the future.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 274 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 8. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1595) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 9. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 595 as specified in section 8 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT
REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the de-

mand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 194, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Gowdy	Petri
Alexander	Granger	Pittenger
Amash	Graves (GA)	Pitts
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pompeo
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Posey
Barletta	Grimm	Price (GA)
Barr	Guthrie	Radel
Barton	Hall	Reed
Benishek	Hanna	Reichert
Bentivolio	Harper	Renacci
Bilirakis	Harris	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Black	Hastings (WA)	Rigell
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Roby
Bonner	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hudson	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rooney
Buchanan	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Hurt	Roskam
Burgess	Issa	Ross
Calvert	Jenkins	Rothfus
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Royce
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Runyan
Cantor	Jones	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Jordan	Salmon
Carter	Joyce	Sanford
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Chabot	King (IA)	Schock
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Schweikert
Coble	Kingston	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Klaine	Shimkus
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Shuster
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Simpson
Conaway	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Cook	Lance	Smith (NE)
Cotton	Lankford	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Latham	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Latta	Southerland
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Stewart
Culberson	Long	Stivers
Daines	Lucas	Stockman
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
Denham	Lummis	Terry
Dent	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
DeSantis	Marino	Thornberry
DesJarlais	Massie	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (CA)	Tipton
Duffy	McClintock	Turner
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Upton
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Valadao
Ellmers	McKinley	Wagner
Farenthold	Meadows	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Walden
Fleischmann	Messer	Walorski
Fleming	Mica	Weber (TX)
Flores	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Fox	Mullin	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Noem	Wittman
Garrett	Nugent	Wolf
Gerlach	Nunes	Womack
Gibbs	Nunnelee	Woodall
Gibson	Olson	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Palazzo	Yoho
Gohmert	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Pearce	Young (FL)
Gosar	Perry	Young (IN)

NAYS—194

Andrews	Capuano	Crowley
Barber	Cárdenas	Cuellar
Barrow (GA)	Carney	Cummings
Bass	Carson (IN)	Davis (CA)
Beatty	Cartwright	Davis, Danny
Becerra	Castor (FL)	DeFazio
Bera (CA)	Castro (TX)	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Chu	Delaney
Bishop (NY)	Cicilline	DeLauro
Blumenauer	Clay	DeBene
Bonamici	Cleaver	Deutch
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Dingell
Braley (IA)	Cohen	Doggett
Brown (FL)	Connolly	Doyle
Brownley (CA)	Conyers	Duckworth
Bustos	Cooper	Edwards
Butterfield	Costa	Ellison
Capps	Courtney	Engel

Enyart	Lipinski	Rangel
Eshoo	Loeb sack	Richmond
Esty	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Farr	Lowenthal	Ruiz
Fattah	Lowe y	Ruppersberger
Foster	Lujan Grisham	Rush
Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Ryan (OH)
Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda
Gabbard	(NM)	T.
Gallego	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Garamendi	Maffei	Sarbanes
Garcia	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Grayson	Markey	Schiff
Green, Al	Matheson	Schneider
Green, Gene	Matsui	Schrader
Grijalva	McCollum	Schwartz
Gutiérrez	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Hahn	McGovern	Scott, David
Hanabusa	McIntyre	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Sewell (AL)
Heck (WA)	Meeks	Shea-Porter
Higgins	Meng	Sherman
Himes	Michaud	Sinema
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Sires
Holt	Moore	Slaughter
Honda	Moran	Speier
Horsford	Murphy (FL)	Swalwell (CA)
Hoyer	Napolitano	Takano
Huffman	Neal	Thompson (CA)
Israel	Negrete McLeod	Thompson (MS)
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Tierney
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Titus
Johnson (GA)	Owens	Tonko
Kaptur	Pallone	Tsongas
Keating	Pascarell	Van Hollen
Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)	Vargas
Kennedy	Payne	Veasey
Kildee	Pelosi	Vela
Kilmer	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Kind	Peters (CA)	Visclosky
Kirkpatrick	Peters (MI)	Walz
Kuster	Peterson	Wasserman
Langevin	Pingree (ME)	Schultz
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Waters
Larson (CT)	Polis	Waxman
Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Welch
Levin	Quigley	Wilson (FL)
Lewis	Rahall	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Clarke	McCarthy (NY)	Neugebauer
Fincher	McCaul	Sessions
Johnson, E. B.	McMorris	Smith (WA)
Maloney,	Rodgers	Watt
Carolyn	Nadler	

□ 1357

Messrs. PERLMUTTER, HIGGINS, GENE GREEN of Texas, and VELA and Ms. DUCKWORTH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. CAPITO was allowed to speak out of order.)

WOMEN'S CONGRESSIONAL SOFTBALL GAME

Mrs. CAPITO. To my colleagues, tonight is a very exciting night for the women of the House, the women's softball team of the House—and the men of the House, and really all families across America—for our fifth annual women's softball team. Our game is tonight at 7 o'clock at Watkins Field.

I am the cocaptain of the team with my esteemed colleague from Florida. And we have trouble agreeing on a lot of things, but I know everybody in this room today will want us to win because our opponents are the press.

So I want to just briefly say thank you to everybody who's been involved in this. We've had a lot of great coaches and we've had a lot of outside help. We've had a lot of fun getting to know each other again and even better.

I'd like to yield to my cocaptain who hatched this idea and have her talk a little bit about why we're doing this.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you very much to my cocaptain, the gentlelady from West Virginia, and to all of our sisters on the Congressional Women's Softball team.

The gentlelady from West Virginia is absolutely right; we may not always agree in the boundaries and walls of this room, but I think all of us can agree that we want to defeat the common adversary—that is, the press corps.

We have been out there for the last 2 months at 7 in the morning two or three times a week. None of us can believe that we actually all get out there at the crack of dawn to make sure that we can build our skills, build camaraderie, make sure that we come together around a true common purpose. We also thank our adversaries, whom we will defeat tonight when we take the field and make sure that we take the trophy back for the women Members.

We've only won one out of the last four games, but the fifth time is a charm. This is the fifth annual game. It happens to coincide with my own 5-year anniversary of being a survivor of breast cancer. And the importance of this game is really that we all are focused on raising money for an incredible charity, the Young Survival Coalition. We are headed for a record-breaking fundraising year.

I want to thank the majority whip in particular for making sure that the schedule accommodated everybody coming to the game. This is going to be a fun family event. Bring your kids. We have face painting and a fun zone and all kinds of food and a great time. We have already presold more than 1,000 tickets before we even get to the door.

So thank you so much. Come cheer on the women Members tonight at 7 o'clock, Watkins Recreation Center, 12th and D Southeast. Take the Eastern Market or Potomac Avenue Metro.

On to victory for the Congressional Women's Softball team.

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 187, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—235

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash

Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus

Barber
Barletta
Barr

Barton
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)

Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzing (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)

NAYS—187

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)

Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette

Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi

Garcia	Luján, Ben Ray	Rush
Green, Al	(NM)	Ryan (OH)
Green, Gene	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda
Grijalva	Maffei	T.
Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean	Sanchez, Loretta
Hahn	Markey	Sarbanes
Hanabusa	Matheson	Schakowsky
Hastings (FL)	Matsui	Schiff
Heck (WA)	McCollum	Schneider
Higgins	McDermott	Schrader
Himes	McGovern	Schwartz
Hinojosa	McNerney	Scott (VA)
Holt	Meeks	Scott, David
Honda	Meng	Serrano
Horsford	Michaud	Sewell (AL)
Hoyer	Miller, George	Shea-Porter
Huffman	Moore	Sherman
Israel	Moran	Sinema
Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)	Sires
Jeffries	Napolitano	Slaughter
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Speier
Kaptur	Negrete McLeod	Swalwell (CA)
Keating	Nolan	Takano
Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Kennedy	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Kildee	Pascarella	Tierney
Kilmer	Pastor (AZ)	Titus
Kind	Payne	Tonko
Kirkpatrick	Pelosi	Tsongas
Kuster	Perlmutter	Van Hollen
Langevin	Peters (MI)	Vargas
Larsen (WA)	Peterson	Veasey
Larson (CT)	Pingree (ME)	Vela
Lee (CA)	Pocan	Visclosky
Levin	Polis	Walz
Lewis	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Lipinski	Quigley	Schultz
Loeback	Rahall	Waters
Lofgren	Rangel	Waxman
Lowenthal	Richmond	Welch
Lowey	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
Lujan Grisham	Ruiz	Yarmuth
(NM)	Ruppersberger	

NOT VOTING—12

Clarke	McCarthy (NY)	Nadler
Fincher	McCaul	Neugebauer
Johnson, E. B.	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
Maloney,	McMorris	Watt
Carolyn	Rodgers	

□ 1409

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 289 on Ordering the Previous Question, H. Res. 274, A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1613—Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, H.R. 2231—Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, and H.R. 2410—Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 290 on Agreeing to the Resolution, H. Res. 274, A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1613—Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, H.R. 2231—Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, and H.R. 2410—Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERMITTING OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BE TAKEN WHILE THE HOUSE IS IN ACTUAL SESSION ON A DATE DESIGNATED BY THE SPEAKER

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 270, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 270

Resolved, That on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives may designate, official photographs of the House may be taken while the House is in actual session. Payment for the costs associated with taking, preparing, and distributing such photographs may be made from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISMISSING THE ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-132) on the resolution (H. Res. 277) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Ninth Congressional District of Tennessee, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I call up House Resolution 277 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 277

Resolved, That the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Ninth Congressional District of Tennessee is dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISMISSING THE ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE FORTY THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, from the Committee on House Administration,

submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-133) on the resolution (H. Res. 278) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Forty Third Congressional District of California, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I call up House Resolution 278 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 278

Resolved, That the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Forty Third Congressional District of California is dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

INSPECTOR GENERAL INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATIONS OF RETALIATORY PERSONNEL ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO MAKING PROTECTED COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING SEXUAL ASSAULT

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1864) to amend title 10, United States Code, to require an Inspector General investigation of allegations of retaliatory personnel actions taken in response to making protected communications regarding sexual assault.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1864

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INSPECTOR GENERAL INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATIONS OF RETALIATORY PERSONNEL ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO MAKING PROTECTED COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING SEXUAL ASSAULT.

Section 1034(c)(2)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “sexual harassment or” and inserting “rape, sexual assault, or other sexual misconduct in violation of sections 920 through 920c of this title (articles 120 through 120c of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), sexual harassment, or”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Sexual assault in the military is maiming our troops. These aren't my words. They are the words of General Raymond Odierno, the Chief of Staff of the Army. He likened military sexual assault to other serious threats that our troops face downrange.

The threat of sexual assault in the military is real. The wounds it inflicts on our servicemembers are also just as real.

I introduced H.R. 1864 with my colleague and tireless advocate Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ. The bill on the floor today is the product of a lot of time and hard work.

I remember sitting in the House Armed Services Committee hearing and becoming shocked as I learned firsthand about the widespread abuse at Lackland Air Force base. I remember thinking that our brave servicemembers deserve so much better and that those in charge deserve to be held accountable. After that hearing, I went to work.

The bill we are debating today is a true bipartisan and bicameral reform that gets to the heart of this issue. It does so by addressing the challenges of sexual assault underreporting that has become too common in the military. The Pentagon estimates that there were approximately 26,000 victims of sexual assault last year. However, only roughly 3,600 victims actually filed reports.

Many individuals don't come forward because they don't have confidence in the military justice system. Others don't come forward because they fear reprisal or they believe reporting another servicemember will negatively impact their own career. This lack of reporting, for whatever reason, demonstrates that we have a real problem.

Before we can truly understand the scope of sexual assault in the military and how to best confront it, we have to find a way to encourage more victims to come forward. We have to find a way to empower the victims and restore their faith in the military justice system. That's what this bill does.

H.R. 1864 strengthens existing military whistleblower protections and

seeks to remove many of the fears and stigmas that deter reporting. The bill requires an inspector general investigation into suspected retaliation in response to allegations of sexual assault. This bill also seeks to help create an environment in the military where victims feel safe to come out of the darkness and to report these crimes of sexual violence.

□ 1420

It is reported that 62 percent of the servicemembers who experienced unwanted sexual contact felt as if they were being retaliated against in one form or another. This is completely unacceptable. Troops who have sacrificed so much for the cause of liberty should not be subject to reprisal after having just been subject to the emotional and physical pain of a sexual crime.

H.R. 1864 is good policy, and the urgency of this issue demands that this Congress act today. Let's be a voice for the countless victims who have already come forward and for the countless more who are still unknown. Let's send a clear and resounding message to the Department of Defense and to those preying on our troops, which is that this type of behavior will no longer be tolerated.

I ask my colleagues to do the right thing and join me in supporting this much-needed measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1864, introduced by me and my good friend and colleague, Mrs. WALORSKI from Indiana.

H.R. 1864 amends title X of the United States Code: to require an inspector general investigation of allegations of retaliatory personnel actions taken in response to making protected communications regarding sexual assault.

As the lead Democratic sponsor of this measure, I support the effort to protect military whistleblowers against reprisal for disclosing violations of law, for sexual assault and other prohibitive sexual misconduct. As such, I am pleased that this bill was also put into the National Defense Authorization Act just about 10 days ago on this House floor.

People have asked me: Why are you bringing this up as a stand-alone bill? My answer is that, last year, we finished and approved and got the NDAA signed on the 31st of December.

This bill really cannot wait. We need it today in the military because the biggest problem we have with respect to sexual assault is that the victims—the people who are being harassed and assaulted—are being retaliated against in the workplace. We do need this. There is no room for misbehavior of any kind, which may hinder the readiness, the morale, and the safety of our units. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure the passage of this important language.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, in 2008, Maria Lauterbach, a female marine from my community, stepped forward to report a sexual assault from another marine. She was subsequently viciously murdered by the accused. Her mother, Mary Lauterbach, took up the issue of sexual assault in the military, and I have worked with her since 2008 on legislative solutions and in trying to change the culture in the military.

With that, I rise today in support of H.R. 1864, the work of Representative SANCHEZ and Representative WALORSKI, as part of that effort for us to change the culture and to provide the tools to victims in the military.

The problem in the military with sexual assault is clear: victims feel revictimized by the system, and perpetrators feel safe. Our efforts legislatively are to change that dynamic in which perpetrators feel unsafe so that we can rise to the level of preventing sexual assaults and, of course, to rally around victims so they feel safe.

Last year, I had the opportunity to attend a breakfast at the Commandant of the Marines' home to discuss the issue of sexual assault in the military. During that breakfast, a female marine, a lieutenant colonel, spoke up and admitted that if she were sexually assaulted that she would not report it. She said the cost in the military is just too high. No one should serve in the military and feel as if one who is subject to a crime is less secure if one steps forward and reports it, especially a crime as heinous as sexual assault.

H.R. 1864 will strengthen military whistleblower protection laws by requiring that victims of sexual assault are protected from punishment or reprisal for reporting their attacks. Through the passage of this bipartisan legislation, introduced by Congresswomen WALORSKI and SANCHEZ, Congress has the opportunity to take the necessary step in providing victims with the confidence, assurance, and peace of mind that they cannot be threatened or punished for reporting a sexual assault.

Recently, the Department of Defense indicated through a survey that 62 percent of those who reported a sexual assault felt that they were punished in the workplace for doing so by both their superiors and their fellow coworkers. This bill will add that additional protection in which they can feel safe once they report the crimes and as they move forward through prosecution.

I applaud Representatives SANCHEZ and WALORSKI for bringing this forward. Everyone should support H.R. 1864.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½

minutes to the gentlelady from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), who has been working on this issue quite hard.

Ms. KUSTER. Thank you, Representative WALORSKI and Representative SANCHEZ, for your friendship and for your leadership on this issue.

Today, I am proud to join my colleagues in passing this bill to strengthen whistleblower protections for those who report sexual assaults in the military. This legislation will help ensure that sexual trauma survivors and others who step forward do not face reprisal for reporting these terrible crimes.

I am especially proud that, of the 110 bipartisan cosponsors of this important reform, nearly 50 are members of the freshman class. I know that these new Representatives are committed to working across the aisle in making commonsense reforms and getting things done for the American people. This important legislation proves that Congress can work together to do the right thing for the American people, and what better issue is there to partner on than in strengthening protections for the men and women of our Armed Forces. This critical reform is a great step forward in further protecting our heroes in uniform who take the extra heroic step of coming forward to blow the whistle on military sexual crimes.

It has been an honor to work with you all to help build support for this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1864 and to continue to work together to end sexual violence in the military.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, a member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentlelady from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues for their hard work and leadership on this issue, and I am very proud to stand up in support of this legislation.

The number is staggering—26,000. That's how many military members were sexually assaulted last year alone, and thousands more were unwilling to come forward.

Research has shown that victims only report, roughly, 14 percent of all sexual assaults to law enforcement. Many who choose not to come forward may not have the confidence that they will actually receive justice. They may fear that reporting a fellow service-member will result in threats or could negatively impact their careers. A recent DOD report showed that 62 percent of victims who reported sexual assaults faced some kind of retaliation. That's terrible.

This legislation is going to provide safeguards and additional protections for victims. By requiring an inspector general investigation into any allegations of retaliatory personnel actions taken against victims, we are clearly

stating that this behavior is unacceptable, that it is inexcusable and will no longer be tolerated.

This legislation is part of a broader effort to do as much as we can to address the problem. For too long, lawmakers, military officials, and civilians have discussed the need to bring an end to sexual assault. This bill is another opportunity to put words into action and to take meaningful steps to address this growing problem. We have a responsibility to ensure adequate protections are in place, and we also have to provide physical and mental support for those victims as well as to insist on swift punishment for those who are responsible.

I am proud that Members on both sides of the aisle have worked on this bill as well as on other measures that we have previously passed as part of the Defense Authorization Act. It is only the start of a process that will change the culture in the military. It will establish a safe environment for all individuals—for service men and women—but we have to continue to do all that we can to solve this problem.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the ranking member on the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel, the gentlelady from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

□ 1430

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I certainly want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle because I think we've seen how people can come together on a serious issue like this that really does affect our national security.

What's so important about this bill is I think it sends a message. It sends a message to perpetrators. But more than that, it sends a message to bystanders that responding to bad behavior is an important and critical thing to do. We can celebrate the good behavior, and I think this is also a way of sending that message. But we're saying that bad behavior will not be tolerated. We see this not just in our Armed Forces, but we see it around the country, as well.

Just recently, General Morrison of Australia had a very, I think, concise and strong message to his troops in saying that the standard that you walk past is the standard that you uphold. Let's uphold the highest standard. Retaliation drives people from not reporting sexual abuse and sexual crimes. We need it to be okay to report because if people are fearing for their career or fearing that somehow they're going to be so demoralized by reporting, that's not going to work.

This is a good bill, and I applaud all my colleagues for supporting it.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentlelady from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R.

1864, a bill that bolsters existing military whistleblower protection laws to clarify that victims of criminal sexual crimes are protected from punishment for reporting those crimes. And I applaud my fellow Hoosier, JACKIE WALORSKI, and the others from the Armed Services Committee in that this has been done in a bipartisan way.

Just this past weekend as a former U.S. attorney and a new Member of Congress, I spoke to an Indiana statewide victim assistance academy, and I shared with them the shocking statistics that they weren't aware of—that 26,000 members that you've already heard about, members of our military, were assaulted in 2012. That is a 34 percent increase from 2010. Only a fraction of these victims file reports, and their abusers remain in the military to assault again. Why? For the same reasons that victims in our civilian criminal justice system face: they are afraid. They face fear. And more than 60 percent of those victims in the military never do report and come forward. But these victims just aren't on our military bases, they come home and they live in our communities. They may be reserve officers, they may be in our National Guards, and they are active enlisted officers and personnel.

Unless we stop this retaliation that these victims face, fewer and fewer assault victims will come forward and report, and more and more attackers will remain free to commit these crimes, and not just on our bases. These crimes often don't happen just once with one woman or, yes, one man. These will happen again and again if the assailant and the perpetrator is not brought to justice.

If we want to end the epidemic of sexual assault in our military, we must ensure that these victims come forward to report their assault without fear that they will be victimized again by the institution, the military they've chosen to serve.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I inquire as to how much time remains on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 15½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Indiana has 10½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time as I have no more speakers.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my freshman friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1864. This legislation addresses a serious problem in our military—sexual assault.

Today's legislation is absolutely critical for creating an environment where victims feel comfortable enough to report crimes of sexual violence. I'm

proud to be a cosponsor of this important piece of legislation. With reports of 26,000 instances of unwanted sexual contact, we must continue to address this unacceptable culture within our military. The lack of reporting in instances of sexual assault is alarming to say the least.

The Department of Defense estimates that only 14 percent of victims of sexual abuse actually report assaults. Today I am voting to end this culture. I'm voting to encourage a reporting of sexual assault in an environment where our soldiers will not fear for loss of their job.

My good friend and my colleague Congresswoman WALORSKI's bill provides protections against retaliation for those that report instances of sexual abuse. Because of her bill, an investigation must be launched in response to any retaliatory action taken against someone that reports an instance of sexual abuse. As a Nation, we have made great strides with women in the military. We need to build upon our efforts to ensure that these women are in an environment where they can feel safe.

I have a daughter who is 2 years away from being eligible to serve our country in the military. I would like to know if she chose to serve our country that she would not be entering the type of culture that currently exists.

I support this bill for all of the fathers like me and mothers and wives and kids who send their loved ones to serve in our great military in this great Nation. We owe those men and women in uniform who sacrifice so much for this country a culture of respect and security.

I know I will be thinking of those victims as I vote today, and for all those that felt their career would be hurt if they were to actually report an instance of sexual assault.

I want to thank again my friend, my colleague, Congresswoman WALORSKI, for allowing me the time to speak and for her leadership on this very important issue.

I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1864, providing protections to those who report sexual assault in the military.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding and for her leadership on this particular issue, and for the wonderful bipartisan support that we've all shown here today.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation that would create a safe reporting environment for military sexual assault victims and would demand accountability from our military leaders.

As a mother with a son currently serving in the 101st Airborne, I know all too well the many hardships and sacrifices that our military men and women face while protecting our country. Every precious moment I have to be able to call or Skype with my son, I am constantly reminded of all of the things that are on his and every other soldier's mind as they are keeping our country safe so that the rest of us can have peace of mind back here at home.

Every servicemember from the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines and Coast Guard bears such a heavy burden to which we all owe our utmost gratitude, and it infuriates me to think that for many of these young men and women, the situation of sexual assault is one of the things they must deal with as they are preparing themselves to face the enemy.

So it is with incredible sadness and frustration that I come before you all today to speak on the increasing incidence of sexual assault in our military and how very few of those cases end up being reported. For many victims of sexual assault, the fear of retaliation by other members of the military prevents them from reporting these crimes, and as a result, they must bear the burden of their emotional and physical pain alone and in silence.

I stand here today to say that our servicemembers who sacrifice so much for the cause of liberty and put themselves in the line of duty should have absolutely no worries about their own liberties and whether they will face retaliation for reporting reprehensible and abusive crimes committed against them.

□ 1440

This legislation would hold the responsible individuals accountable for their actions and would require an inspector general investigation into allegations of retaliatory actions taken against victims who have reported alleged instances of rape, sexual assault, and other forms of sexual misconduct in the military. Existing law already provides these whistleblower protections for a member of the Armed Forces who reports sexual harassment. And by extending these protections to reporting of more serious crimes of sexual assault, it is not only just common sense, it is simply the right thing to do. And it needs to be done now.

By doing nothing, we are implicitly allowing the continuation of this deplorable behavior and allowing those who have committed these crimes to go unpunished. Not addressing sexual assault in our military threatens to erode our Armed Forces from within and gives people considering enlisting, along with their families, even more to worry about as they consider the great responsibility of serving our country.

I am so proud of my son and the rest of our Armed Forces, and I will do everything to protect the integrity and the reputation of our military. This legislation is the first step we can take

in fixing this problem and shows that we take these allegations very seriously.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this bipartisan bill that will help protect our servicemembers as they protect us.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I want to express my gratitude to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) for the leadership she has brought to this issue, and for the bipartisan manner in which she and Ranking Member SANCHEZ have approached this issue to bring together a bill which we can focus on, we can agree on, and we can pass to address a problem that does need our attention and our best efforts.

We have heard about the 26,000 estimated sexual assaults that are taking place in our military each year. Now, as we look at those numbers, we have to look at the number that are reported—3,374. That is the number of reports—3,374. More stunning is the number of convictions—238 convictions. That is what we have learned from this DOD report. As we've heard, the reason given for the lack of reporting is because so many fear retaliation and the fact that it would negatively impact their career. Sixty-two percent—62 percent—give that as their reason.

I think the scope of the problem is much larger than we know at this point in time, and here is an example. On May 15, police arrested Fort Campbell's sexual harassment prevention manager on charges involving stalking his ex-wife. That's important to me and my district because Fort Campbell is in my district. Now, if you can't turn to the people who are there to protect, who are you going to go to when you have one of these situations?

As a woman and as a strong supporter of our Nation's military, I find it absolutely appalling that any woman who has been the victim of crime should have to fear reporting her perpetrator for fear of retaliation.

Again, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the two Members who have worked so diligently on this, Mrs. WALORSKI and Ms. SANCHEZ.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how many speakers are left on the other side?

Mrs. WALORSKI. I'm prepared to close.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, the United States military is an institution comprised of men and women who have dedicated their lives to not only defending this country but also upholding the values of this Nation—the values of this Nation. The values of this Nation say that if you go into the workplace, you should be treated equally, you should

be treated with respect. And when we have sexual harassment and sexual assault happening in the workplace, in particular in our military, and when we have someone report and say, Hey, this is happening, and then they are retaliated against either because coworkers are afraid to be around them or because higher-ups make an example of them in some way, we have to say enough is enough.

I think the time to pass this bill is now, and I want to thank the gentlelady, the Hoosier across the way, for working in such a bipartisan manner to get this done. I know there are so many in the Congress who feel very strongly that the sooner we protect the workplace, the better off this Nation is.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I would like to say that H.R. 1864 is a long overdue solution. It's the place to start, a foundation on which to build.

I'm grateful to my colleague, LORETTA SANCHEZ, for partnering with me, for her multiyear commitment to this issue. We worked closely with the HASC staff and the Department of Defense to craft this legislation. The bill was included along with many other good provisions addressing military sexual assault in the House-passed NDAA a few weeks ago. With over 110 bipartisan cosponsors, the House has shown that it can come together on serious issues and get things done.

Senator KLOBUCHAR has also introduced companion legislation in the Senate. Too many victims have already suffered. These assaults are happening every day. There's no reason to wait even longer for the NDAA to become law when we have a solution today.

Congress must act with a sense of urgency to approve thoughtful reforms combating sexual assault in the military. I'm hopeful that this measure passes, the Senate quickly takes it up, and we can send it to the President for his signature. I'm asking my colleagues to act today and pass this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1864, which addresses sexual assault in our armed forces. This bill amends the Military Whistleblower Protection Act to strengthen protections for those reporting rape or sexual assault.

Enacting this legislation is a critical step towards combating rape and sexual assault in the military for two reasons.

It will immediately require an investigation into allegations of whistleblower retaliation in an attempt to encourage victims to come forward. It also seeks to help remove some of the fears and stigmas associated with reporting sexual assault.

In the long term, it is part of a cultural change in how the military addresses sex crimes. Sexual assault will not be tolerated, perpetrators will be punished, and victims will not be ignored or harassed.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1864. I stand today in support

of women. I stand today in support of the armed forces, and in support of veterans, both male and female, all throughout this great country. As our armed forces fight everyday to protect us, serve us, and guarantee our safety, it is, in turn, our duty to do all that we can to protect them.

That is why I stand in support of H.R. 1864, and implore my colleagues to do the same. This bill not only ensures protection for whistle blowers and deters retaliation from complaints, but it also serves as an important step in guaranteeing the safety of those who protect us.

The Pentagon reported this spring that an estimated 26,000 troops experienced sexual assault last year. This number is an estimate because only 3,374 of the assaults were reported. Out of 26,000 assaults, only 3,000 were reported. That means that about 89% of all assaults went unreported. And that's only half the battle. Out of the more than 3,000 assaults reported, less than 10% of the suspects involved were convicted. Further, a report publicized by the San Antonio Express-News, detailed an investigation in May that found that half of the convicted offenders were allowed to stay in the military. This is outrageous. It is proof of a broken system, one that is doing our service women a complete disservice. It is a compound injury; beginning with assault, ending with underreporting.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to be missing the point. Senator MCCAIN would discourage women from enlisting until the military can clean up its act. Senator CHAMBLISS attributes the problem to natural hormone levels in males, saying during a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing on sexual assaults in the military that: "The young folks that are coming into each of your services are anywhere from 17 to 22–23. Gee whiz—the hormone level created by nature sets in place the possibility for these types of things to occur."

This is not just a classic case of "boys will be boys" as Senator CHAMBLISS suggests, this goes beyond a "hook-up mentality", and discouraging women from joining the armed forces is NOT the answer, as Senator MCCAIN would suggest. The system is broken. And our service women are suffering as a result. This is a structural problem, and as such, requires a structural solution. By approving H.R. 1864, we begin to change the structure of the legal processes surrounding sexual assault.

The number of sexual assault victims in the military is intolerable, as is the rate of underreporting. Victims lack confidence in the military justice system, with good reason, and do not come forward because they fear that reporting a fellow service member will result in negative unintended consequences. This legislation strengthens existing protections and ensures victims do not suffer reprisal for reporting acts of sexual assault. It is important that we create the proper avenues for victims of sexual assault to avoid re-victimization through the legal process. This is the very least we can do for the service men and women who serve us 24/7,365.

I urge all members of the House to join me in voting to protect our protectors by voting "aye" on H.R. 1864.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1864.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1450

BUILDING AMERICA'S ENERGY SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity for the next hour to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives and to the American people some very important issues pertaining to America's potential to be energy secure.

This is an interesting week that we would have this discussion. This is a week when the House Committee on Natural Resources is bringing forward two bills for consideration that will tear down some of the barriers and remove some of the regulations that have gotten in the way of tapping into the vast resources of oil and gas off our shores.

We know that there's been growth in oil and gas development in our country, but not offshore. And yet we know there are vast resources that would be very, very important to America's energy security.

At the same time, this week we also have our President, who made official his declaration of war against coal, stating, once again, that fossil fuels are the bad guy somehow. At a time when we're looking to create jobs, create wealth, create opportunity, he puts up yet more barriers to the development of these vast resources of fossil fuels.

Since coming to Congress 6 months ago, I have heard our President and his allies in this Chamber often reference the fact that since Barack Obama was elected President, America's oil and gas production have actually increased. They brag about this increased production and the jobs that it creates as though they had something to do with it.

Well, on behalf of the citizens of my State of North Dakota, let me just say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, you're welcome because the fact of the matter is that, yes, production of oil and gas in this country is up. It is up, except where the Federal Government is the landlord, because the large reserves under Federal lands and offshore resources are going untapped because of Democratic opposition to using the incredible opportunity that

new technologies have created to get us more jobs, more opportunity, and more energy secure.

I want to illustrate a point today by reading one sentence from a recently released State Personal Income Growth Analysis put out by the United States Department of Commerce. Here's the sentence. It's very profound:

State personal income growth ranged from a -.2 percent in South Dakota to 12.4 percent in North Dakota.

That's right. Two rectangles in the center of the North American map, two Dakotas, side by side, two States that basically have the same size and land mass, the same size in population, the same climate, same cultures, they grow vast amounts of food to feed a hungry world.

We're similar in nearly every way. And yet the Dakotas differ in one significant way, and that is my State of North Dakota has fossil fuels that South Dakota does not have.

I point to this distinction because I believe it represents the possibilities of America. It represents what can be done in much of our Nation if the Federal Government would just get out of the way and allow the unleashing of American ingenuity and the development of American energy.

Instead, what we get from our President is more restrictions on the use of fossil fuels and more fantasizing about unproven, uneconomical, unreliable alternatives. And while billions of tax dollars get wasted experimenting on whimsical dreams of a carbonless future, American job opportunities are lost and our debt rises.

Our President continues to pursue an energy policy based on an old model, an old model of resource scarcity, rather than on the new reality of resource abundance.

According to the Institute of Energy Research, underneath Federal land and offshore, that is to say, Federal oil and gas reserves, at today's prices, the United States taxpayer has \$128 trillion worth of fossil fuels that we're not tapping into.

Resource abundance: abundance based on the application of new technologies is transforming our economy and has us on the path to security. And North Dakota is evidence of what can be done in our country.

But there are a lot of speakers today that have a lot to offer in this discussion and this debate, and right now I'd like to yield to my good friend from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota. And I'm excited about the opportunity that we have in this country in a bright energy future. I can think of few areas that have held so much promise for job creation, for a new opportunity to impact so many areas of our economy as energy. And it really is energy policies that we're discussing this week that could create over a million jobs around the country, and the policies that we continue to pursue in committee meet-

ings, through legislation and the work that we do to help bring a brighter energy future to this country.

And I'm pleased that the gentleman from North Dakota is leading today's discussion on energy. You know, I've actually seen in my district the benefits of the Bakken Development in Colorado.

Sixty miles away from my hometown is a brand-new business that located in Colorado because of so much activity in North Dakota. They were actually seeing so many people working in North Dakota that they moved to Colorado to expand their operation because they couldn't find enough people to work in North Dakota.

So they moved to my district to create jobs, and they're hiring. They're manufacturing. They've bought a manufacturing business because of energy development in North Dakota.

But the energy success in Colorado isn't reliant on other States around us because we have it in our State as well. In my district, the Fourth Congressional District, it is truly an all-of-the-above energy district. Not only do we have a coal mine in the Fourth Congressional District, but we have wind manufacturing, we have wind turbine manufacturing, wind blade manufacturing, we have solar manufacturing. We have biofuels and are home to one of the Nation's premier oil and gas plays anywhere in the world, the Niobrara shale play.

In fact, in Colorado, over 100,000 people are directly employed or indirectly employed by the oil and gas industry. The average pay of a worker in the oil and gas fields of Colorado is almost \$100,000 a year. Average pay of almost \$100,000 a year, with benefits. People are able to stay in their home towns to have jobs that they never thought were possible just a decade ago.

I come from a very small town in eastern Colorado; 3,000 people, 67 kids graduated in my high school class. And I can tell you, when I graduated there are only two or three of us that stayed there to work in our hometown. Everybody else moved away to find work elsewhere because they couldn't find work in that small, eastern plains community.

But thanks to natural gas development, thanks to the development that's taken place around the State, they're moving back, they're bringing their families back. They're actually finding those high-paying jobs with good health care benefits, and they're building our communities and making stronger places to live for themselves and their families; \$10.2 billion in labor contributions, and contribution to the labor force as a result of oil and gas development in Colorado alone.

In Weld County, we've seen the impacts firsthand of what it means to have an all-of-the-above energy policy. Just two of the over-30 oil and gas companies that are operating in Weld County, just last month paid their 2011 property taxes. These two companies

paid a combined property tax to Weld County alone of \$150 million. Two checks, \$150 million to one county; 40 percent of that \$150 million went to the school districts and the community college. That's money that we're investing into the next generation of workforce in this country. That's money that is building a stronger education future for our children.

But it's also developing affordable energy opportunities for this country; and so I hope that as people participate in this discussion around the United States, that they go to Twitter and send their suggestions on energy affordability with the #affordable energy, #affordable energy to participate in a discussion about the future of energy in our country.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think the opportunity that we have, really, today is to join a discussion about what we're going to look like as a Nation, how to encourage manufacturing, how to encourage new job creation, how to bring companies back to the United States who've left because of the cost of doing business. They can now afford to do business here because of our energy production and energy opportunity.

So join us at #affordable energy on Twitter, and I just appreciate your leadership and the opportunity to be here with you today.

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you for sharing that, and for the invitation. I very much appreciate your referencing the cost of energy. Affordable energy, after all, really is a driving factor in many other investment decisions and job opportunities. And I think we'll have much more on that as we work through this important hour of discussion.

With that, I would like to yield some time to my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHFUS.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Colorado for bringing this important discussion on energy and jobs.

And it's not just the folks out west who are excited about energy. We in Pennsylvania are very excited.

In fact, I'm from the southwestern part of Pennsylvania, and yesterday I was driving through the city of Pittsburgh around the same time that President Obama was renewing his war on coal from behind a podium in Washington, D.C.

Our coal miners and steel workers built Pittsburgh. However, if the regime that President Obama and the unelected bureaucrats at the EPA, that regime that they're planning for the next 20 years, if that regime had been in place in the 19th century, Pittsburgh might not have become the great American city that it is today.

The regulations introduced yesterday by President Obama are only the latest salvo in his war on low-cost American energy. These new regulations will result in more shuttered coal mines, power plants, and more lost jobs.

□ 1500

When our coal miners and power plant workers lose their jobs, we lose people vital to our communities and we lose wages and tax revenues critical for supporting local small businesses and schools. These new regulations will also raise energy prices and significantly impact moms and dads sitting around the kitchen table paying their monthly utility bills.

Long story short, this war on coal is a war on the livelihoods of millions of hardworking middle class men and women in western Pennsylvania and around the Nation. It's a war on good-paying American jobs, a war on American opportunity, and a war on American prosperity. And it must end.

President Obama and unelected Federal elites must be held accountable for the negative impact these regulations will inflict on hardworking moms and dads. The REINS Act, which I support, would hold them accountable by requiring that any regulation with an annual economic impact of \$100 million or more must be approved by Congress. Any regulation that has that much impact on our country should be voted for in Congress.

Low-cost American energy is a major factor in economic growth and job creation. Every business and family uses fuel and electricity. The Federal Government needs a commonsense, straightforward, all-of-the-above energy policy to spur growth and get our economy booming again. The House Energy Action Team is a great group of Members dedicated to that goal. Coal, wind, natural gas, solar, nuclear, thermal, hydro, and oil must all play a part in powering our economy. Western Pennsylvania offers unparalleled opportunities and is benefiting economically, thanks to the development of our plentiful energy resources.

The economic benefits are not limited to the energy sector. Lower energy prices resulting from increased domestic production would benefit the entire economy. For each new energy job, three or more additional new jobs are created across the economy. These are good-paying American jobs.

This week, the House will consider legislation that would create over 1 million new good-paying American jobs, bring more domestic energy to the market, reducing costs for families and businesses, and reduce our dependence on foreign oil. President Obama and the Senate need to get serious about an all-of-the-above energy approach to domestic energy exploration and development so that we can grow these jobs. By safely and responsibly developing all of our Nation's natural resources, we can re-light our economy, add jobs, and move towards North American energy independence. In short, this will improve the quality of life for western Pennsylvania and all Americans.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I appreciate his raising the point of the war on coal

and talking about the economic benefits of coal in Pennsylvania.

I don't know if anybody noticed, but deep in that 21-page declaration of war on coal, or the climate change document, the President actually talks about another important fossil fuel that Pennsylvania is tapping into—and that's gas—in the attack on methane. So those that think perhaps natural gas will be the next great fuel to replace coal ought to think again, because as soon as they have their way shutting down every coal plant, they'll be after the gas plants as well. We truly need an all-of-the-above.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for yielding and bringing this important issue to us today to have a conversation on.

I am a firm believer in the all-of-the-above approach to our energy needs of America. Making energy in America domestically will lead to us being energy secure. It's about energy independence. It is about developing our resources, both fossil fuels in the short term and mid term, but always keeping an eye on the alternatives and renewables for the long term so that we create a portfolio of an all-of-the-above that will ensure that America's national security is taken care of when it comes to our energy needs.

Being from New York, I spent a lot of time dealing with the issue of natural gas development and the Marcellus Shale and Utica Shale formations. I can share with you many stories from farmers as I went through the northern tier of Pennsylvania, which is just over the border from my district in Corning, New York. And I remember one story in particular. I went to a family farm that I was invited to go to by an individual in my district who was opposed to natural gas development. However, when I arrived at that farm, I met with her father, and I sat at her father's living room table and had a conversation about what this meant to that family farmer.

I can tell you what I heard really resonated with me. Because what I heard was, I know that my daughter is opposed to this. She's concerned about the impacts on our farm and that type of thing. But I can assure you I've owned this farm for generations, and I'm going to make sure that my land is protected and it's done right and it's done safely. But what I'm also doing is I'm taking the royalty payment, the cash payment from that resource, and I'm putting her daughter through college.

Think about that, ladies and gentlemen across America. We have spent trillions of dollars on the war on poverty and hardworking taxpayer dollars to try to get people out of poverty—most of the time by educating them. And here you have a gentleman who is going to use a resource that he owned, a property right that he owned, and was empowering the next generation

with a college education that that individual did not have to pay for and didn't come out of college with \$50,000, \$70,000 worth of debt. That's a game-changer when it comes to the war on poverty, in my opinion.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments from before. Because when we talk about this issue, we also have to look at it from many different aspects. And it's not just about being an economic resource in regards to the resource itself but being a resource that re-powers America, as I cochair the Manufacturing Caucus here in Washington, D.C., that gives us the power to start building things here in America again and selling it overseas. That's the America I want to stand for.

If we're going to melt steel, if we're going to have that industrial revolution of the 21st century that I believe we can have, we're going to need power sources to do that. And you can't melt steel, in my opinion, with just wind-mills and geothermal and solar panels. They have a role in our energy portfolio but you need those fossil fuels that we have been blessed with to come online to provide the power, the utility, and the energy to do what needs to be done in order to build it here and sell it there. So I appreciate the gentleman bringing this issue to the forefront.

And one last point I will stress. As I represent the 23rd Congressional District in New York, we are going through the process of seeing two main coal-fired plants be shut down. And I'm hopeful. We're doing our work in Dunkirk, New York, and Lansing, New York, on the other side of the district, to stand for repowering those power generation facilities with natural gas, as the applications are pending in Albany.

With this war on coal that just came out yesterday from the White House, if you shut down those plants, what I'm concerned about is my taxpayers that I care about in Dunkirk and Tompkins County and Lansing are going to see their real property tax bill go up anywhere from 50 to 60 percent. Those are hardworking Americans that are already under the burden of a tax burden that comes out of Washington, D.C., by way of income taxes. But there are also tax burdens in our States. And one of those primary tax burdens is the real property tax bill.

I'm hearing from seniors, I'm hearing from people across the district who say, Tom, I can't afford it anymore. And you shut down a power plant, and you take away that tax base from my people, the remaining taxpayers, who most of the time have been there for generations, will see their real property tax bill go up 60 percent. That's thousands of dollars. And in this day and age when people are struggling, why would we commit ourselves as a Nation to a policy that would put a higher burden on their back? I don't get it.

I think we should have an open conversation about doing all of the above,

recognize where those energy sources are in the portfolios, and then we join hands, we come together, and we develop that comprehensive energy policy that we say, This is good for America, both short term, mid term, and long term. And let's get it done. And that's where those of us on this side beg our colleagues on the other side to join us in this effort. And we want to do it safely, we want to do it responsibly. We respect our environment. But we're going to do it in a commonsense way, looking at it from the perspective of hardworking taxpayers of America, not through the lens of bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

With that, I appreciate the leadership that the good man from North Dakota has exhibited on these issues.

□ 1510

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you so much. Thanks for your stories. I think they illustrate so beautifully the importance of an all-of-the-above energy policy that keeps prices rolling.

You know, one of the things I thought about as you were talking about jobs and this cascading impact of this war on coal and war on fossil fuels, there is a survey every year that's taken by an area development magazine, it's called Site Selector Survey. It asks site selectors, What are the characteristics, what are the factors that you look at when making a determination of where to put a manufacturing facility or some other business?

When I was an economic development director 15 years ago, the cost of available energy was somewhere between 15th and 20th on the list. It's moved up to the top five. Our competitive advances in the global marketplace rest with our ability to keep energy costs low.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), who has provided real leadership on some of the issues we are going to be taking up this week.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

I have stood on the floor many times in my short service in the United States Congress to talk about this very topic, and that's American energy independence.

We hear terms like all-of-the-above energy approach and energy policy. I like to think about an all-American energy policy where we utilize American resources to meet our energy needs in this country.

I applaud the House Republicans, and specifically the House Energy Action Team, for focusing on three things—jobs, energy security, and national security. And they go hand in hand.

By pursuing an all-American energy policy, we're putting Americans to work. Whether you're talking about voting the Keystone pipeline or talking about offshore drilling, putting Americans to work is what's important.

I think about North Dakota and an energy-driven economy in North Da-

kota, your great State. They give you a job when you get off an airplane up there whether you need one or not; that's how many jobs they have available. If you're looking for work, America, go to North Dakota. But let me tell you, that's a microcosm of what we could be in this great Nation if we truly pursued an energy policy utilizing American resources, putting Americans to work. That's really what it's about. And that's one thing that I think the House Energy Action Team is focused on.

The second thing is energy security: lessening our dependence on foreign sources of energy, utilizing the resources that we have in this country. God blessed the United States of America with the resources that we have here: oil, natural gas and coal.

We heard just this week that the Obama administration is going to wage a war on coal—not that they haven't already been waging a war on coal. But I think they're waging a war on American energy independence. Because by utilizing the resources that we have in this country, we could lessen our dependence on foreign sources and make certain parts of the world that seem hostile to American interests not so important. So American energy independence is the second thing.

The third thing segues right into that, and that's national security. In fact, I think it was Admiral Mullen that said there is no national security without energy security. Think about that for a minute. Energy security means that we do have national security, that we can meet our energy needs, not just to drive our economy and the engines of our economy, but also fuel the engines of our United States defense. Putting those airplanes in the air and the ships in the oceans and the tanks in the desert or in the forest, that takes energy. If we can meet our needs through American resources, then we do have true American independence. An all-American energy strategy is the right thing for this country.

Just this week, we're going to take up two very, very important bills. One of them deals with opening up all of the Outer Continental Shelf areas that are currently off-limits under the Obama administration moratorium—the moratorium that George Bush lifted. He said, you know what, we need to be energy independent; we're going to lift the moratorium for offshore drilling, and we're going to open up those areas for more utilization. And so we're going to do that.

Off the coast of my State, South Carolina, and Virginia and other places, we're going to go after those resources that we believe to be there. We're going to allow exploration. We're going to allow production. And we're also going to allow revenue-sharing back to those States whose economies are struggling now just like the U.S. economy when we're \$17 trillion in debt.

Our State economies are struggling as well. But we can utilize and bring back revenue to the States through revenue-sharing. An example is Wyoming gets \$1 billion a year in revenue-sharing for production on Federal lands. The Gulf Coast States get revenue back to those States. South Carolina would love to benefit from that as well.

The second thing—and I'll end with this—is a bill that I have on the floor that I authored that would implement an agreement that was signed by the Obama administration. Hillary Clinton—Secretary Clinton at the time—entered into this agreement with Foreign Minister Espinosa of Mexico that said, you know what, we have a maritime border, a border between the United States and Mexico. Out in the Gulf of Mexico in the water is a maritime border and, guess what, there are resources underneath that border. Who owns those? Does Mexico own those resources? Do we own those resources? They're shared resources.

So they entered into this agreement and said we're going to go after those in the Western Gap, not over near Cuba, but closer to the western side of the gulf. We're going to go after those resources, and we're going to allow exploration of those resources, production of those resources. And we're going to share those revenues with each country because we are co-owners of those resources.

They got this one right with this agreement. We're going to implement that because we waited a year on Ken Salazar with the Department of the Interior to send us the implementing language so that we can go forward with a lease in that area of the Western Gap, but he failed to do that. So we took the bull by the horns in the United States Congress, and we authored this legislation and said we think this is important to American energy security; we think this is important to national security; and we're going to work with our southern neighbor in Mexico, and we're going to develop those resources in that transboundary area with a hydrocarbon agreement, and we're going to go forward with implementing that. That's what this bill does.

America understands that we've got the resources. America understands we can work with Mexico and safely and soundly harvest those resources using American safety standards and regulation standards. It is the right thing for America, and that's H.R. 1613. I look forward to passage of that.

I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for his leadership on the House Energy Action Team.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for his leadership today and his leadership on this important legislation coming out of the Natural Resources Committee.

I would like to speak specifically to some more economic opportunity as illustrated from my home State of North Dakota just to get a sense of it.

North Dakota's gross domestic product increased from \$34 billion in 2011 to \$38.7 billion in 2012. That's a 13.4 percent increase, representing the most significant growth of any State in the country last year. Texas is second with a growth rate of 4.8 percent, where the national average during the same time was 2.5 percent.

So it can happen. It happened in my State because the vast majority of the oil and gas in North Dakota is not under Federal land. The vast majority—like over 90 percent—is under private land, where the only landowner is the guy that farms and ranches the land, the person whose sustainability demands good stewardship. We can show the way in how to do it around the country as well as offshore if you just unleash American ingenuity.

I suspect that my good friend from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) might have a thing or two to say about this week's declaration of war on coal, and so I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate the opportunity to address the President's Climate Action Plan that he unveiled yesterday and what this really means to my fellow Kentuckians and my fellow Americans all around this country.

As you see from the exhibit right here, this is the quote from the President's climate adviser:

A war on coal is exactly what's needed.

While Kentuckians and Americans all around this country are suffering from high unemployment—in large part due to the 5,700 coal jobs lost over the past 2 years—yesterday, the President of the United States re-declared the war on coal.

We know that 1 year ago, the President, through his New Source Performance Standards regulation, imposed an effective moratorium on coal-fired power plants coming online in the future. Yesterday, the President said that he wants to apply that moratorium to the existing coal-fired fleet.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow Americans, the President's Climate Action Plan reveals a leader of our country who is woefully out of touch with the economic realities facing the American working family. Unemployment is still at 7.6 percent across this country; 5 consecutive years of unemployment higher than 7.5 percent. Five years in a row where the workforce participation rate—where the percentage of Americans who are of working age population are actually in the workforce—is only 58 percent. Fifty-eight percent of all working-age people in this country have jobs. That's all. That's 5 percent below the historic average of 63 percent.

□ 1520

Twelve million Americans struggling to find work, wages falling for 5 consecutive years, three-quarters of Americans' paychecks are insufficient to get them by each and every week—they're

living paycheck to paycheck. What does this President do? He declares a war, not just on coal, but the working families of America. And worse, he's doing it by making an end run around Congress. His own Democrat-controlled Congress in 2009 refused to pass his radical energy rationing scheme, cap-and-trade, through legislation. So now this President says, Well, Congress doesn't matter, and so I'm going to impose this on the American people through bureaucrats in the executive branch.

Mr. President, you are not king. The Congress of the United States is the law-making body, and the unaccountable, unelected bureaucrats in the executive branch cannot do this without proper statutory authorization. That's why we need the REINS Act. That's why we need to rein in burdensome regulations. That's why we need to make sure that unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats in the executive branch don't seek to impose by fiat a regulatory apparatus that commands and controls the American energy future.

This is a question about American energy freedom, a top-down command and control approach versus American energy diversity. The President wants to impose energy rationing, and we say let the American people decide what their energy sources should be.

Half of all energy production in the United States in 2008 came from coal. Ninety percent of all electricity in my home State of Kentucky comes from coal. In 2012, however, only 37 percent of our electricity came from coal. This President wants to take that number down to 0 percent. So when the President's climate adviser says that he wants a war on coal, he means it.

This is what I want to conclude with. This is not just about statistics about coal jobs lost or energy freedom or the fact that we've lost nine power units, coal-fired power units, in Kentucky in the last several years. This is about human beings. This is about people who have lost their jobs. This is about the President of the United States attacking a way of life.

President Obama and his administration display a stunning lack of compassion. Not once in his remarks yesterday did we hear any recognition, any understanding of the suffering the administration's new proposals will inflict in the communities of central Appalachia, in the suffering of the communities that have already endured a disproportionate share of pain during the last few years. The President's climate action plan substitutes numbers and theories for flesh and blood. It presents climate change as a perpetual crisis justifying one regulation on top of another without any consideration of the cost to real people.

How much is enough, Mr. President? Where does it all end? By the Obama administration's own admission, U.S. carbon emissions fell to the lowest level in two decades. The President, of all people, should read this statistic and conclude it's time for some breath-

ing room, time to let the coal industry adjust, time to let people recover. But you don't offer breathing room in a war.

In yesterday's New York Times, the White House climate adviser said a war on coal is exactly what we need. But this isn't just a war on an entire American industry; it's a war on coal miners and their families. And these coal miners, the 5,700 coal miners who have lost their jobs in eastern Kentucky over the last 4 years under this administration, they depend on those paychecks; their families depend on those paychecks. They don't have the political clout to attract this President's attention or concern, but they are Americans. What a dramatic shift from a half century ago when Presidents Kennedy and Johnson focused so much energy on alleviating poverty in the very same mountain counties the Obama administration is now ravaging with these heartless policies.

Mr. President, if you truly care about people, come to eastern Kentucky. See what happens when \$70,000-per-year jobs disappear overnight because of unaccountable bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. At least give us some consideration of that. Better yet, start working with the coal industry to address climate change concerns and stop trying to kill it. It's time this administration put people ahead of its radical ideology.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his good leadership on this important topic on the importance of coal as a major player in our energy fleet.

If I could just for a second, Mr. Speaker, inquire about the balance of time available in the hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Dakota has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky's speaking to the issue of coal, because like oil and gas, coal is also important to North Dakota. It's an industry that's been around for decades. In fact, we really learned about energy development in North Dakota on coal. We have a little better than 17,000 folks that are employed either directly in the coal industry or in one of the service industries that service the coal industry. It contributes about \$3.5 billion to our State's economy. That's a lot in our little State.

We've been mining coal for decades. We've been mining 30 million tons a year for decades. We use that coal right in North Dakota, burning it to generate electricity at seven power plants in our State, and we generate some of the lowest priced electricity in the country. Again, getting to the issue of affordable energy, very important in terms of our competitiveness in the global marketplace.

So it's not just about the jobs, as important as those are—high-paid jobs, I

might add—but it's also about the competitive edge it gives us with lower cost electricity.

But in North Dakota, under our beautiful prairies, there's an 800-year supply of coal. To wage war on it today and leave 800 years' worth of a product that provides wealth and jobs and opportunity and low-cost electricity in the ground makes no sense whatsoever.

With that, I want to yield some time to my neighbor and good friend who knows a fair bit about the energy industry himself—in fact, I have to admit the Bakken was actually discovered in the State of Montana—the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I'm grateful for my good friend from North Dakota, KEVIN CRAMER, for this time to talk about what is really important to the people out in the heartland, which sometimes is a very different set of values than what we find right here in the beltway of Washington.

I was also struck by my good friend from Kentucky, ANDY BARR, as he shared his comments. It reminds me that we are the party, we are the leaders back here standing for the working middle class in this country, standing for jobs, for revenues that go to our schools, and the tax base for low-cost energy. This President says one thing, but the consequence of this policy is something that will only ultimately benefit the elite and the wealthy in this country instead of the regular working families in this country.

I want to thank my friends here today for organizing this Special Order and bringing attention to the importance of an American energy sector to our economy and to the daily lives of all Americans. In Montana, we know the importance of a robust energy sector.

Whether it's oil, gas, coal, wind, water, biomass, it's all needed to create jobs and keep energy costs low for the people of our country. In fact, one of my priorities in Congress is to fight for the all-of-the-above energy plan that helps grow American jobs, lowers energy costs, and helps us fight for North American energy independence, energy security.

Unfortunately, President Obama does not seem to share this goal. In fact, yesterday, President Obama unveiled his latest energy plan, a job-killing agenda that will hurt American jobs and American families and small businesses.

□ 1530

After his announcement yesterday, President Obama made a commitment to waging war on American energy, which was made crystal clear. In fact, by imposing further barriers to the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline and by working to severely hinder American coal production, President Obama has unveiled a misguided agenda that will only hurt Montana and American energy consumers and will cost good-paying Montana jobs.

Montana's energy sector is a huge driver for our State's economy. Our coal mining industry employs over 1,200 workers across our State. Montana contains more coal reserves than any other State in America, and it ranks number six overall in coal production nationwide. Additionally, coal production provides critical funding for Montana schools, as much of our State's coal is located on school trust lands. We forget about the contribution to our tax base, that of helping build schools and funding teachers, which comes from the energy industry.

The development of our coal reserves produces millions of dollars for Montana public education every year. My daughter is a senior at Montana State University, preparing to graduate and go into elementary education in Montana. Energy production will be critical to funding our public schools in Montana as we look down the road.

We have also seen tremendous growth from the booming development of the Bakken formation, as my friend from North Dakota alluded to, which spreads across eastern Montana and into western North Dakota. Oil production in our State has created thousands of good-paying jobs, both in the oil fields and also in the service industries that are at the heart of many of our small towns.

I would like to have the President come out to eastern Montana and see what's happening out there. Families are struggling, living month to month, but are seeing the benefits now of the energy industry as they are seeing paychecks they can count on as they look forward. It has also injected millions of dollars into our State's economy; and, like coal, it has helped provide millions of dollars in much-needed funding for Montana's schools. Recent reports show that Bakken oil production currently accounts for 11 percent of the total U.S. oil production and represents 40 percent of increased oil production nationwide. If the Keystone XL pipeline is built, it would be able to move up to 100,000 barrels of oil. That's Montana and North Dakota oil per day from our very own Bakken formation.

Mr. President, I am in favor of "made in America" energy. Montana's natural resources, like coal and oil, not only provide our State and Nation with quality American energy, but they are helping keep the utility costs low for hardworking American taxpayers. Montana gets more than half of its power from coal. That helps keep electric rates low. We see some electric cars driving down the highways today and in our towns. I'm not opposed to electric cars; but if the truth be known, we ought to have a sticker on the back that reads: "This electric car likely powered by coal." The average retail price in Montana is currently 8.4 cents per kilowatt hour, which is among the lowest in the Nation.

The construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, on the other hand, would also have a tremendous impact on energy

prices for Montanans. In fact, not too long ago, I was traveling around our State. I am the only Member of Congress for the State of Montana. It's a privilege to represent an entire State. I was up in Glasgow, Montana, meeting with the NorVal Electric Co-Op. I learned that the NorVal Electric Co-Op is expected to supply power for one of the Keystone pump stations. If the Keystone pipeline is built, it will help NorVal keep its customers' electric rates stable for the next 10 years. Think about that—10 years of no increase. Contrast that to, if the pipeline is not built, NorVal expects that their rates will grow upwards of 40 percent over the next decade.

Mr. President, these customers at NorVal live month to month. They live paycheck to paycheck. This is what is helping American middle class, hard-working taxpayers survive—expanding our energy production. By declaring a war on energy right now, you are declaring a war on American families who are struggling every month to make ends meet. For most Montanans who live on tight budgets and who carefully track where their paychecks are going, unlike a lot of the folks around here in Washington, D.C., a 40 percent increase in utility rates would be devastating. Unfortunately, under President Obama's agenda, that very well could happen.

President Obama's war on coal would severely hinder coal production in Montana and the jobs that rely on this important industry. It would be a serious blow to Montana families and to small businesses that rely on coal as a reliable source of affordable electricity. Just as bad, this job-killing agenda will be imposed through unilateral action, demonstrating that the President is more set on achieving his own political goals rather than on listening to the will of the American people or on working to create much-needed jobs.

Mr. President, the people of America are focused on paying their bills every month. That's a higher priority to them than your priority, which is that of winning an election in 2014.

By sidestepping Congress and public scrutiny, President Obama will set his agenda in motion through costly regulations and more and more red tape and bureaucratic hoops. These roadblocks won't just hurt the coal industry as we know President Obama and his advisers seek to do; these regulations will hurt hardworking American taxpayers who rely on American energy each and every day.

Let me be clear: President Obama's agenda isn't just a war on coal. This is a war on Montana energy, on Montana families, on Montana small businesses, and on Montana jobs—and it must be stopped. I will remain steadfast in this fight to stop the President's job-killing agenda, and I look forward to working with my colleagues here today on commonsense policies that grow American energy and help create the good-paying

jobs that the American people desperately need.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I especially appreciate your reference to the Keystone pipeline and to the importance of the role of electric cooperatives.

A lot of people forget that there is a Keystone pipeline. There was actually one sited and built with very little fanfare. I was at that time a member of the North Dakota Public Service Commission and carried the pipeline portfolio and sited the first 220 miles in the United States of the original Keystone pipeline. It didn't go anywhere near the Bakken, unfortunately; but it did cross 600 landowners' land—green field all the way, two scenic rivers. We put a lot of restrictions on it, but it was with very little fanfare. In fact, every landowner willingly signed the contract. There wasn't a single inch of that pipeline in North Dakota that had to be condemned to be built.

It was interesting because we have, I think, five or six pumping stations in North Dakota on the original Keystone, and the co-ops were all sort of arguing about whose territory would it be in because every pumping station was a load equivalent to a city of 10,000 people. For those who argue that it's not about the United States, the Keystone XL, that's big time for the people of North Dakota and for the people of the United States. It is about the United States. So I appreciate your raising that issue.

Another State that has a lot to lose in the war on coal and a lot to gain by more offshore drilling is Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I thank you so much for the opportunity to speak this afternoon on these important issues.

It's true that offshore in Virginia is something we've been discussing since 2004. What's interesting is that a lot of the folks said, You don't really want to do that in 2004. It's not going to really help gas prices. Do you know why? Because it will take 7 to 10 years to get it developed.

Guess what? If we'd have started in 2004 drilling off the coast of Virginia, we'd be getting that natural gas, and we'd be getting that oil off the coast of Virginia right now. It would be creating jobs. It would be creating tax dollars that could go to schools, roads—you name it—whatever the legislature in Virginia decided it wanted to spend it on. It could be going to increase the revenues of the United States of America as well. Likewise, this Congress could then be debating the expenditure of those funds and what we wanted to do with those moneys.

Instead, the naysayers keep saying, Well, not now, not now. I say to them, If not now, when? When are we going to do this? We know it's out there. We know it's a huge resource for the United States of America.

Then yesterday, on top of blocking our ability to get from the other side of the State the natural gas and the oil that is there and that we know is there and that we want to get to, the President of the United States declared what I call the "war on coal—phase 2." He has already been involved in phase 1 for some time, but in his comments yesterday, he made it clear that he's not going to wait for science to get us a solution—because it's coming. There is research that's being done on chemical looping and on other ways to use coal cleanly, where you end up with coal ash and carbon dioxide—no SO_x, no NO_x, no mercury. It's coal ash and carbon dioxide, and you can recycle the iron pellets that they use. I mean, it's really a wonderful process, but we have testing left to do on it. It has already been working at Ohio State University. They are building a facility in Alabama, and they are going to be doing testing beginning later this year that will end next year on a bigger project than what they did at Ohio State, but still it's got another phase to go even after that.

If we wait just a few years and if we do reasonable things now and if we wait for science to catch up, we can, in fact, accomplish what the President wants to accomplish on the environment and not destroy the jobs of southwest Virginia, the central Appalachia region and all other coal-producing States. There are more than 20 of them that are coal-producing States. We will be damaging their economies if we go forward.

□ 1540

It's interesting that the President noted in his speech and said:

Now, what you'll hear from the special interests and their allies in Congress is that this will kill jobs and crush the economy.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, that's exactly what you'll hear. Do you know why you're going to hear it? Because it's true.

And if being a special interest means you have to be one of the people that lost their job in the coal fields of southwest Virginia or Kentucky or West Virginia or any of the other States where jobs—we've been losing them monthly. We get reports of another 25 here, another 15 there, people who've been laid off in the coal fields. And it's not just the coal fields. It's the railroads that haul the coal. It's the people at the manufacturing centers that make the equipment for the mines. It's the car dealerships that used to sell cars to the miners, who used to have jobs.

Let me make something clear, folks. Being in the mine is a hard job. There's no question about it. And we want to make sure health concerns are taken into consideration because it does have dangers to it. There is no question about that. But the workers in those mines are making somewhere between \$75,000 and \$95,000 a year if you add in their benefits. You take a district like

mine, the Ninth District of Virginia, where the average household income is around \$36,000 a year, and you start laying off 15 \$75,000 to \$95,000-a-year jobs here with health insurance included, you lay off another 25 jobs here and 30 jobs there, and ladies and gentlemen, you want to talk about destroying the economy, you're darn right you're going to destroy the economy. And if standing up for the special interests of the people who work in the mines, the people who work in the equipment factories, the people who work at the car dealerships, the people who work at the restaurants in southwest Virginia is a bad thing, then I guess I'll just keep doing a bad thing because I will continue to fight for southwest Virginia and the jobs in the coal fields.

The other thing the President went on later to say was that this issue didn't used to be partisan and now it's partisan. Guess what? The President is wrong. This is a bipartisan issue. And I'm going to look at the Bluefield Daily Telegraph and read you some quotes from some of my Democrat colleagues because it's important for the people of America to know that the President may want to divide, but in the coal fields we understand exactly what this is going to do to our jobs and our economy, and ultimately to the economy of the United States of America.

U.S. Representative NICK RAHALL, Democrat of West Virginia said:

Obama's climate change plan is misguided and could cost millions of jobs.

That's not a Republican. That's a Democrat. He goes on.

The misguided, misinformed and untenable policy that the President put forth this afternoon puts at risk the energy security of America and the jobs of millions of our citizens.

RAHALL continued saying:

Locking away the fuels that power our Nation behind ideologically imposed barriers will drive up costs for nearly every business and manner of industrial activity while driving jobs overseas. Households already struggling to make ends meet will see energy bills skyrocket.

That's NICK RAHALL, Democrat of West Virginia. He goes on to say:

The administration should be advocating new clean-coal technologies as opposed to crippling regulations.

Isn't that really where the President has been going the whole time? He said in the San Francisco Chronicle interview of 1-17-08:

When I was asked earlier about the issue of coal, you know under a plan of cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.

NICK RAHALL:

Households already struggling to make ends meet will see energy bills skyrocket.

The President is doing what he said he was going to do. He declared war on coal, and now he's going to try to see if he can't finish it by devastating the American economy and the economy of southwest Virginia and central Appalachia. It's just not right.

Mr. President, let's look at the science that your administration has invested money into. Chemical looping may be the way that we can both have what we want. I want and my colleagues want jobs for America, tax dollars coming in off of coal severance, natural gas, offshore drilling. We want to see those tax revenues coming in because then we can use that to help Americans. We want to help all Americans. You want to clean up the environment, and so do we. We can do it, but we have to be reasonable.

Let's go forward and look at another Democrat, and that would be Senator JOE MANCHIN, and he touches on this point in his comments in the Bluefield paper. U.S. Senator JOE MANCHIN, Democrat of West Virginia, said:

Obama's plan will have disastrous consequences for not only the coal industry, but also American jobs and the economy.

Democrat MANCHIN goes on:

The regulations the President wants to force on coal are not feasible. And if it's not feasible, it's not reasonable.

It's clear now that the President has declared a war on coal. It's simply unacceptable that one of the key elements of his climate change proposal places regulations on coal that are completely impossible to meet with existing technology. The fact is clear: our own Energy Department reports that our country will get 37 percent of our energy from coal until the year 2040. Removing coal from our energy mix will have a disastrous consequence for our recovering economy.

These policies punish American businesses by putting them at a competitive disadvantage with our global competitors, and those competitors burn seven-eighths of the world's coal, and they're not going to stop using coal any time soon. It's only common sense to use our domestic resources, and that includes our coal.

Senator MANCHIN is absolutely right because let me tell you that when we burn coal here and we create jobs here in the United States of America, as you well know, that means we're not sending those manufacturing jobs overseas to another country. Particularly if those countries are in Asia or in some of the emerging economies, they don't have anywhere near the regulations we have. They don't have the regulations we had in the year 2000 or the year 2005 to comply with.

So we can create the goods here, create jobs for Americans, create tax dollars which will help us deal with the national debt and deficit problem. We can do all of that here, and we can do it by burning coal more efficiently and cleaner than the countries that we're competing with. But instead the President wants to ignore all that. He wants to ignore those facts and go forward and say, No, we can't do that.

I go on with the quotes from the San Francisco Chronicle because right now he's not singing the same tune. He goes on to say after the "skyrocket."

Even regardless of what I say about whether coal is good or bad, because I'm capping greenhouse gases, coal power plants, you know, natural gas, you name it, whatever the plants were, whatever the industry was, they would have to retrofit their operations. That will cost money. They will pass that money on to consumers.

Who are the consumers? I believe the consumers are the average family out

there, the single parent trying to raise children, the elderly, the folks trying to struggle with that \$36,000-a-year-annual-household income, the miners and the workers in the factories that produce the goods that help the miners do their job who now don't have jobs, they're still going to have that electric bill coming in.

You know, it's interesting that the President actually cut in his budget proposal the LIHEAP money, which is the program to help the people who can't afford to pay their heat bill. So at the same time we're creating more unemployment, we are also going to take away some of the benefits that helps those folks. It just doesn't make sense. The President's policies don't make sense, and I submit to you all that the President needs to rethink this. He needs to look at clean-coal technology because that's the winner for America, for American jobs, for American prosperity and for America to go forward into the future, leading the way.

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you so much for your insights and your experience in this very important industry of coal and all of the things that it supports and that support it.

I think that an appropriate way to sort of wrap this discussion up is to remind folks that while we are advocates for domestic energy development, American energy production that creates a competitive global advantage in all areas, we are also good stewards of the environment.

Let me just close with this. These counties in North Dakota that have seven power plants burning coal, all got A ratings from the American Lung Association. And I believe that the same God that created the beauty and splendor of the oceans and the mountains and the prairies and the topsoil, put the minerals underneath it, and we ought to use all of them for our benefit.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

□ 1550

U.S.-MEXICO BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a place that is very near and dear to my heart, a place that is the source of great beauty, the source of millions of jobs for this country, an economic driver, not just for the region that I represent, not just the State in which my district resides, but for this entire country and, for that matter, this hemisphere.

I am here today to speak about the U.S.-Mexico border, and I have the privilege and honor of serving with

other Members who represent significant sections of the U.S. side of the U.S.-Mexico border. We are joined today by SUSAN DAVIS from California; PETE GALLEGOS from Texas; and FILEMON VELA, who is also from Texas. But before I yield to them, I want to talk a little bit about my special section of the U.S.-Mexico border in El Paso, Texas.

El Paso is home to more than 800,000 people who, along with the citizens of Ciudad Juarez, form one of the largest binational communities anywhere in the world. El Paso has for decades served as the Ellis Island for Mexico and much of Latin America. Literally millions of immigrants who are now U.S. citizens, who are productive members of our communities, have passed through the ports of entry in the district that I have the honor of representing.

Beyond that and beyond the human dimension of what the border produces, the beauty, the wonder, the creativity, the culture that develops from there, the border also is an important part of who we are as a country and our past. It is one of the most essential places anywhere in the United States today, as seen by the debate that is taking place in the Senate; and it is the future of this country, whether you look at it demographically, whether you look at it economically, whether you look at it culturally or by any other measure, the border is absolutely critical to the United States.

I want to talk about a couple of aspects that help to define this critical place that the border holds for this country. I thought I would start with trade. There are more than 6 million jobs here in the United States that are dependent on the trade that crosses our ports of entry at our southern land ports between the United States and Mexico. More than 100,000 of those jobs are in the district that I represent in El Paso, Texas. The State of Texas itself has 400,000 jobs that depend on this trade. More than \$300 billion a year flows between our two countries. Mexico is the second largest export market for the United States. We are the largest export market for Mexico. And a critical aspect of the trade that comes into the United States from Mexico that is very important to remember is that unlike any other trading partner that we have, more than 40 percent of the value of the trade that comes north from Mexico originated in the United States. So we are literally producing together even those things that are imported into the United States from Mexico.

Again, Mexico is a source of jobs. It's the source of so many things that are positive to our economy, our culture, and to our communities; and all that comes to a head at the U.S.-Mexico border.

Now, if you're listening to the debate that is taking place right now about comprehensive immigration reform and some of the provisions that have passed out of the Senate and some of the commentary that you read in the newspapers or the talking heads that you see on TV, you might not know that. You might instead see the U.S.-Mexico border as a source of anxiety, as a threat to this country's security and its future, as something to be feared, to be locked down, to be secured, and to be forgotten.

We're here to tell you today that the facts and the truth and the reality could not be further from the current debate that you're hearing on the public airwaves today. In fact, the community that I represent, El Paso, Texas, is the safest city in the United States bar none. It was the safest city last year in the United States, and the year before that. In fact, for the last 10 years, El Paso, Texas, has been among the five safest cities anywhere in the United States.

But El Paso is not alone for its security along the U.S.-Mexico border. San Diego is the second safest city in the United States. Laredo recently ranked as one of the top safest cities of any city in the United States. In fact, if you're on the U.S. side of the U.S.-Mexico border, chances are you're safer there than you could be anywhere else in the country.

And these benefits do not just accrue to El Paso, to Texas, and to the border lands. There are jobs, tens of thousands of jobs, hundreds of thousands of jobs in States throughout the country, billions of dollars of economic growth related to our trade with Mexico, not just in Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California, but Montana, Florida, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan. Again, it is important to emphasize that even that trade coming north from Mexico in many cases originated in these other States that are not border States.

So one of the messages that we hope carries from today is regardless whether you are in El Paso, Texas, and understand the border inherently, or if you're in Detroit, Michigan, you have a vested interest in a healthy border. A healthy border equals a healthy U.S. economy. That equals more jobs, more economic growth, and more positive factors for the U.S. going forward.

So with that introduction of what it is that we hope to cover today, I now want to yield to PETE GALLEGU, who by land mass represents almost a quarter of the State of Texas, someone who has served in the State legislature, someone who lives and understands the border and can speak to the positive dynamics that we see there.

Mr. GALLEGU. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman O'ROURKE, my fellow west Texan, with whom I share the privilege of representing El Paso County, for yielding me this time to talk about some issues that are critical to the border.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't want to use any incendiary rhet-

oric. I don't want to use any flashy words because, frankly, I think that the people of this country elected their Members of Congress not to cheerlead or use harsh rhetoric or add fuel to fires, but to solve problems. So I would like to talk about some of the challenges that in real terms this Congress has the opportunity to make a difference on.

The 23rd Congressional District, which I have the privilege of representing, runs some 800 miles along the Texas-Mexico border. It includes five ports of entry: Eagle Pass, Del Rio, Presidio, Fabens, and El Paso. No other congressional district shares a larger border with Mexico. The district is both rural and urban; and, frankly, it looks like what the rest of Texas will soon look like because it is evenly split between Democrats and Republicans. Because this district has the largest border with Mexico, the policy discussion about border security, about immigration reform, these conversations greatly impact the 23rd Congressional District. Frankly, they impact the entire State of Texas. The passage or failure of immigration reform will profoundly affect us all.

In Texas, there are approximately 1.7 million unauthorized immigrants comprising 6.7 percent of the State's population. According to a 2006 report from the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, who was a Republican office holder at the time, she indicated in her report the absence of the estimated 1.4 million undocumented immigrants in Texas in fiscal year 2005 would have been a loss to our gross State product of \$17.7 billion. Well, as public servants, as I indicated early on, the weight of our words is rather heavy. I have asked the current controller to provide an updated study to shed some light on the true impact, the current impact, that our State has as a result of these undocumented immigrants.

□ 1600

The study would ensure that all 38 Members of Congress from Texas, and everyone else, can have adequate information during what is a very important policy debate.

A more recent study from the Immigration Policy Center noted that if all unauthorized immigrants were removed from Texas, the State would lose \$69.3 billion in economic activity. The State would also lose \$30.8 billion in gross State product, and approximately 403,174 jobs, even accounting for adequate market adjustment time.

Well, after more than two decades, I'm very encouraged that comprehensive immigration reform is clearing hurdles in the Senate. I'm hoping that our colleagues in the House will take it up as well as soon as possible.

Make no mistake. The legislation that's in the Senate, it's not what I would have drafted. Those of us on the border know that what we need are more Customs and border protection agents at our ports of entry.

Many jobs in Texas, much of our economy, in fact, is inextricably linked to international trade. In fact, more than 50 million Americans work for companies that engage in international trade. That comes to us from the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

Trade with Mexico represents one of our biggest economic drivers and pumps billions of dollars into our economy every day. Every day, think of this, \$1 billion in cross-border commerce happens between the U.S. and Mexico. That equates to some \$45 million in commerce per hour.

Staffing increases at our ports would decrease wait times at our ports of entry, would increase security, and would lead to more effective screening and entry for those who are traveling, as well as for imports that are coming into the United States. It is those long lines at our ports of entry that hinder economic development and harm our economy.

Yes, it is true; no one will argue that our Nation's doorways must be secure and that our trade and our commerce along the border on which many small and large businesses depend must be allowed to move efficiently. And I'm hopeful that as debate on the immigration issue continues, as we continue our conversations, that we can increase the staffing at CBP, a policy move that does, in all truth, make sense for Texas.

But as far as the fence is concerned, the border fence, in a time of tight budgets, I have to say that I'm very perplexed as to why Congress would spend so much money on an ineffective project. You'd be hard-pressed to find too many Texans, particularly those who live and work or have been raised along the border, who support the notion of a fence.

Let me give you a couple of examples and a couple of quotes:

The idea that you're going to build a wall from Brownsville to El Paso is just—it's ridiculous on its face.

That quote comes from the Governor of Texas, Rick Perry, just last year.

How about this quote?

The border fence is a 19th century solution to a 21st century problem.

That quote comes to us from Senator JOHN CORNYN of Texas in 2006.

As I've said, I'm opposed to the notion of a border fence and would rather that we shore up our ports to speed up commerce. A fence isn't something that those of us who represent the border support, but we understand that it is important to bring families out of the shadows.

Economically, here is what comprehensive immigration reform means to those of us along the border and elsewhere:

To each and every one of us, it means that our deficits will decrease, while GDP, productivity, investment, and employment will increase. Our country will save over \$1 trillion, or about \$1 trillion over the next two decades. More than 10 million people will pay

\$459 billion just in income and payroll taxes during the first 10 years. And over that decade, we will reduce the Federal deficit by \$197 billion and will add more than \$200 billion into the Social Security trust fund. The decade after that, comprehensive immigration reform will reduce the Federal deficit by \$700 billion.

In Texas, all the key players are standing steadfast for immigration reform. It's supported by the chambers of commerce. It's supported by the Texas Farm Bureau. It's supported by labor, and it's supported by public opinion in our State because it makes economic sense.

My paternal grandfather worked cattle and founded a small family restaurant that launched our family into the middle class; my maternal grandfather built fences across the hard-scrabble landscape of far west Texas; and today, I have the privilege of representing the 23rd District in Congress.

In this Nation, our values teach us that families stick together and that hard work, not circumstances, should shape our future. It really is a country of opportunity. Our Nation becomes stronger as more people pledge allegiance to our flag and commit themselves fully to our Nation and to our economy.

I'm hopeful that we can move quickly on this, this very important policy matter that greatly impacts not only the 23rd District, but the entire State of Texas and, frankly, our country as a whole. Immigration reform is right. The time is right, and Texans are counting on us.

It is significant, if you've ever been in the Texas capitol. Years ago, our forefathers and foremothers who built that beautiful pink granite building faced the front door in a certain direction. Our front door of the State capitol doesn't face north, towards Washington. Our front door faces south, towards Mexico. The front door to our Nation, as Governor Richards used to refer to it, is a very important doorway for trade, for commerce. It's historically significant, not only for Texas, but for the rest of our country.

Again, immigration reform is right for Texas, it's right for America, and it's something that this Congress should make sure happens as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very grateful to Congressman O'ROURKE for yielding me this time.

Mr. O'ROURKE. I want to thank Representative GALLEGOS for his very eloquent support of moving forward with comprehensive immigration reform and doing so in a rational, fact-based manner. And I think he would agree with me that we are very pleased to see progress being made in the Senate. Whether it was originally with the Group of 8 or the 60 or more Senators who have since joined them in key supportive votes to move this forward, I'm happy that we're making progress.

What concerns me are some of the provisions that specifically relate to the U.S.-Mexico border:

You're talking about 600 miles of border fencing and walls that currently exist being expanded to more than 1,400 miles of the 2,000-mile border. You're talking about a Border Patrol force that today is more than 20,000, which is more than double what it was in 2001, being doubled yet again to more than 40,000, and all this for the cost of upwards of \$50 billion a year. And as Representative GALLEGOS pointed out, this is at a time of tight budgets, of sequester, of record deficits and debt. We simply can't afford to move forward like this.

But I will grant the proponents of these measures this: there's a certain crude logic to that. If you have a problem with immigration, if you have a problem with flows northward from Mexico and Latin America, then putting a wall in place, doubling the Border Patrol that's patrolling that line, there's a crude logic to it. And it's a solution, albeit a 19th century solution, as our Senator said, to a problem, but it is a problem that, by all accounts, does not exist.

Net migration from Mexico last year was zero. We had record southbound deportations, record low northbound apprehensions. We're spending \$18 billion a year on border security, twice what we were spending in 2006.

As I mentioned before, we've more than doubled the size of the Border Patrol, and the border is as secure as it has ever been. El Paso, the safest city; San Diego, the second safest. The U.S. side of the U.S.-Mexico border is the safest place to be anywhere in the United States today. We had no less authority than the Secretary of Homeland Security say the border is as safe as it has ever been. The head of the Border Patrol said the border is as safe as it's ever been. By any rational measure, that is not where the problem exists.

This next slide, I think, in an image and in a picture, shows you where the problem exists today.

□ 1610

This slide here represents the Paso del Norte port of entry coming back into El Paso from Ciudad Juarez. There are 6 million crossings each year between El Paso and Juarez, and many of those coming north are U.S. citizens, Mexican citizens, and tourists visiting our region, who face these kinds of lines that can last upwards of 4 hours to enter the U.S. And for those of you who have not been to El Paso, you may not know that we, with Ciudad Juarez, are literally joined at the hip. Our street grids flow into each other. Our families live on both sides of the border. We may wake up in El Paso, do business in Juarez, and come back at the end of the day—or vice versa. We are truly a binational community. And when you choke commerce that supports tens of thousands jobs in my

community, jobs throughout this State and this country, you're doing a disservice not just to us—because I don't expect the rest of Congress to care about the border, necessarily—not just to the State of Texas, but you are doing harm to the national economy.

So if we need to spend more money, if we need to put tighter focus on the border, this is where we need it. And those Border Patrol agents that we have are doing a remarkable job, and we stand fully behind them and want to make sure that we support them in their current objectives and that we can afford to pay them what they're owed, which by the way, under the sequester, we're not doing today.

Instead of taxing resources where we already have it covered, let's move those resources to our ports of entry and make sure that we have Customs and Border protection officers who can speed the flow of legitimate travel, trade, and commerce through our ports of entry. That will create jobs not just for my district and improve the quality of life not just in El Paso and along the border, but it will be a net benefit to this country. It will be an investment that pays back many, many times over.

And now to hear from somebody who also understands the U.S.-Mexico border quite well and who lives there, who has his family there, has grown up there, and has done a remarkable job representing the interests of the U.S. border, I'd like to yield to FILEMON VELA from Brownsville, Texas.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. O'ROURKE for putting together this Special Order.

Today, I rise in opposition to provisions which condition a pathway to citizenship on the construction of additional border fence. Historically, our country has criticized the construction of barriers of all kinds. For instance, in 1987, President Reagan stood at the Brandenburg Gate near the Berlin Wall and said, Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall. Two years later, the wall was demolished, ushering in a new era of economic harmony.

As someone who lives on the border in Brownsville, Texas, I can state with certainty the argument that construction of additional border fence will stem the flow of undocumented immigration and increase border security is flawed, for many reasons.

First, erecting some more border fence drives a wedge between border communities which are culturally united. Many who live on the U.S. side of the southern border have family and friends who live on the Mexican side and vice versa. The current border fence has come to symbolize divisiveness and serves as a daily reminder of a flawed immigration system. For this reason, the residents on both sides of the border oppose the border fence.

Second, the construction of additional border fence will damage already fragile wildlife and natural resources. Bobcats, coyotes, owls, lizards,

snakes, and raccoons all rely on habitat on both sides of the border. Additional fencing will adversely impact these and other animal habitat.

Third, erecting additional border fence will cost billions of dollars. This money could be more efficiently spent on less intrusive, high-tech border surveillance and economic aid to border communities in the U.S. and Mexico. The focus of these provisions is misguided, as it promotes a quick fix to a problem that is rooted in violence and lack of opportunity. Since 2006, approximately 71,500 people have been killed as a result of cartel violence in Mexico.

While Mexico's overall economy has performed exceedingly well in the recent past, economic conditions along the U.S.-Mexico border remain consistently stagnant. The real solution for reducing the flow of undocumented immigrants into this country from Mexico is to promote economic development on both sides of the border, thereby providing more economic opportunities for an ever-increasing population. Fostering a vibrant border economy will mean that young men and women will have an option other than organized crime to provide for their families.

While this amendment ignores the fundamental cause of illegal immigration into the United States, it also does not account for the deep trade ties between the United States and Mexico. As my colleague from Texas mentioned, last year alone the United States greatly benefited from the estimated \$500 billion in trade with Mexico, supporting 6 million jobs across the United States. Trade with Mexico even impacted the economy of Alaska and our island State of Hawaii. Importantly, trade with Mexico is critical to the economies of States on the border and those far removed from the Mexican border. And I will give a few examples.

In the State of New Hampshire, for instance, the total trade volume between the State of New Hampshire and the country of Mexico is \$1.5 billion. Computers and other electronic products amount to \$680 million, or 72 percent, of New Hampshire's total exports to Mexico. And 28,531 jobs in the State of New Hampshire depend on trade with Mexico.

In the State of New York, the total volume of trade between the country of Mexico and the State of New York is \$5.67 billion. New York exports \$2.6 billion of goods to Mexico, and 381,238 jobs in New York rely on trade with Mexico. Mexico ranks among New York's 10 international markets, with 384,000 travelers per year. Jewelry is one of the largest exports from New York to Mexico, with \$500 million in value.

The State of Pennsylvania, the total volume of trade between the State of Pennsylvania and the country of Mexico is \$5.59 billion, and 246,409 jobs in Pennsylvania rely on trade with Mexico. Primary metal manufacturers are

Pennsylvania's top sector in exports to Mexico, representing \$560 million and 21 percent of the State's total exports to Mexico. In addition, \$547 million in primary chemicals are exported to Mexico.

In the South, the State of Tennessee, the total trade volume between the State of Tennessee and the country of Mexico is \$7.62 billion. Tennessee exports \$3.81 billion to Mexico. Twenty-three percent of all cotton exported to Mexico from the U.S. comes from Tennessee, making the State the second largest exporter of cotton to Mexico, with \$256 million in revenue. Also, \$855 million worth of transportation equipment is exported to Mexico from the State of Tennessee, and 122,085 jobs in Tennessee depend on trade with Mexico.

The State of Alabama, the total volume of trade between the State of Alabama and the country of Mexico is \$2.7 billion. Alabama exports \$1.72 billion worth of goods to Mexico. Transportation equipment is the State's largest export industry to Mexico, generating \$466 million and representing 27 percent of the State's exports to Mexico; and 86,212 jobs in the State of Alabama depend on trade with Mexico.

The State of Kansas, the total trade volume between the State of Kansas and the country of Mexico is \$2.38 billion. The State of Kansas exports \$1.63 billion in products to Mexico. Crop production is Kansas' strongest industry in terms of exports to Mexico, accounting for \$588 million in export revenue annually and 37 percent of total exports to Mexico. Eleven percent of aerospace products exported from Kansas go to Mexico. Mexico is the largest importer of corn and the third largest importer of beef from the State of Kansas. And 59,341 jobs in Kansas depend on trade with Mexico.

□ 1620

Clearly, all States benefit greatly from trade with Mexico. Erecting more border fence would chill the robust economic relationship that our country and our States enjoy with that country. Rather than constructing new hurdles to trade with Mexico, we should be tearing down trade barriers in order to promote and strengthen our relationship with our neighbor country.

Mr. O'ROURKE. I want to thank my colleague from the Rio Grande Valley. Here he is meeting the anxiety, the paranoia, and the legislation based on emotion instead of facts with the cold, hard truth of our economic interdependence with Mexico. We ignore this at our peril and to the peril of millions of jobs in this country, hundreds of billions of dollars of economic opportunity and growth.

We welcome the focus and the attention at the U.S.-Mexico border, but we want those who are watching to see the truth. The truth is we are a positive, dynamic source of jobs and economic opportunity for this hemisphere for both Mexico and, most importantly for

us in this body, here in the United States.

It is my feeling that the wall that exists today—the 600 miles of the 2,000 miles that join the United States and Mexico—the 600 miles of fencing today will soon be looked at by a majority of Americans in this country as something to be ashamed of, as folly that followed the paranoia and the anxiety that we have towards Mexico and the U.S.-Mexico border today.

When you think about the cost of this wall, the current wall cost us more than \$2.4 billion to build and will cost us another \$6.5 billion to maintain for just the next 20 years. Why would we then spend more than \$16 million per mile for additional walls that will cost us billions of dollars to build over the next 5 or 10 years and then probably hundreds of millions, if not billions, to remove once we've realized our mistake, which I hope is not too far in the future.

If there is fear and anxiety and frustration with Mexico, I'd like to know where that's coming from, because it's not coming from the facts and the figures that we see in El Paso and that we see when we look at Mexico. Mexico is a growing, dynamic, vibrant economy. It has millions of people moving into the middle class. It's modernizing. It's breaking up its monopolies.

The country of Mexico has more free trade agreements with other countries than any other country on the planet. This is a country that wants to move ahead, that wants to do well for its citizens, that's investing back in itself and is providing opportunity so that people don't seek that opportunity in other countries like the United States. I think that helps explain why net migration from Mexico into the U.S. was at zero this past year.

Again, Mexico is not a threat. The U.S.-Mexico border should not be a source of anxiety. Mexico is a big part of our future, it's been a big part of our past, and it's a positive source for those things that we want to see happen in this country.

Someone who understands that quite well from representing her district along the U.S.-Mexico border in southern California—part of a State, by the way, that has seen more than a 30 percent drop in crime over the last 10 years despite, and maybe because of, the fact that it borders Mexico and has such large immigrant populations—I'm happy now to yield the floor to my colleague from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be here with my colleagues today. I certainly want to thank Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. VELA and Mr. GALLEGOS for presenting what we all believe is so critical and so important.

It's not just about border communities and border cities that acknowledge and benefit from our relationship with the border, and particularly with the Mexican border; it really is the entire States that we're representing and

far beyond that. Because my colleague represented how much trade is done in other States throughout our country—we know it's important to national security—we also know it's important to our economic interest, because that trade fuels our economy, it stimulates our competitiveness, and it also reflects our cultural values. Those things are critically important, and we need to bring those into the discussion as well.

You know, we often talk here in Congress about the need to give businesses the certainty that they need, but honestly, look at what's been happening today. The budget standoffs and sequestration are doing just the opposite of what our businesses really need. In fact, Congress' inability to pass legislation is jeopardizing our greatest opportunity right now, which is economic growth, and that is our commerce along our borders.

Six million U.S. jobs depend on trade with Mexico. Shall I say that again? Six million U.S. jobs depend on trade with Mexico. Last year, imports from Mexico accounted for more than half of our two nations' total trade, which is about \$278 billion. Sometimes we can differ slightly on those numbers, but that's about what it is. That trade relies on modern infrastructure, it relies on roads, and it relies on ports of entry that can accommodate the enormous volume of goods coming through every single day.

But what's the reality today? Well, the reality is that our ports of entry are in various states of disarray because of underfunding for improvement and modernization projects. Our ports do not have the capacity to meet this demand, meaning that often people have to wait up to at least 2½ hours during the day of commerce and trucks up to 6.

You know, there's an app out there that tells users how long of a wait to expect. In San Diego, in the district, wait times on Sundays at the San Ysidro Port of Entry can reach 3 to 4 hours, and now and then it can even exceed that.

The other day, I was up early getting ready to board a plane to come into Washington from San Diego; and even at about 5:30 in the morning, at the ports of entry, the wait was about 1 hour and 45 minutes. And you know what? They were celebrating the fact that it was only that long.

You have to come down to the border to see this. I think for folks who don't live on a border like we have in San Ysidro in San Diego, you can't even imagine how many cars are assembling there. It's pretty spectacular. And you know what? It shouldn't be this way, and it doesn't have to be this way. No modern economy can operate under those conditions. No modern economy devotes just \$50 million to fund infrastructure projects for ports of entry for our entire Nation. Think about that: \$50 million for all of our ports of entry.

What we should be doing is viewing our ports of entry and our borders as

assets to our Nation. But instead, chronic underfunding has led to wait times that cost our country every day in total productivity loss and tax revenue. It's tremendous. Wait times translate to \$7.2 billion in output loss and cost us upwards of 62,000 jobs—62,000 jobs—people who could be working if we could make our ports of entry more efficient.

Well, we do have some good news. Congress has already authorized infrastructure improvements at the Nation's ports of entry, including critical phases at the San Ysidro Port of Entry in San Diego. We know that's the busiest land crossing in the world. So that's the good news that Congress has authorized that.

What's the bad news? The bad news is that Congress has refused to provide the funding necessary to break ground on those two additional phases. And you know what? That's just not consistent for what we talk about as needing a border security bill for this Nation. The fact that that is so underfunded and chaotic, by any means, suggests that we don't really think that we need to do the right thing when it comes to border security.

So let's place the need where it belongs. It belongs on infrastructure, and it belongs in trying to figure out what is it that's going to make a difference for this country. Well, certainly funding that border security will help on the border for ports of entry.

If there is one thing that this body should be able to do, that we should be able to come together on, it should be a smart investment that businesses want and workers need. I can assure you, that's what they want and businesses need.

So I urge my colleagues to get to work on a budget that supports our Nation's ports and our engines of economic growth and place the need for border security where it belongs. We know that it will help create the economic engines that we need for our future.

Thank you so much to my colleagues. I appreciate your bringing us together for this.

□ 1630

Mr. O'ROURKE. Thank you Representative DAVIS. I appreciate hearing, again, more facts, more rational arguments, from my colleague from California about the border. I place that in contrast to, again, the anxiety and the fear that is surrounding much of the border policy that we're hearing from the Senate and in some circles here in the House.

The reason that we are so sensitive to that here on the U.S. side of the U.S.-Mexico border is we bear the brunt of those policies. The disproportionate burden of the enforcement, of the cost to our economies, to our way of life, falls to those communities that reside on the U.S. side of the U.S.-Mexico border.

But what is the source of that anxiety and fear? Where does it come

from? If I had to characterize it bluntly, I would say that it comes from those who feel that Mexican nationals are coming to our country to steal our jobs, take our resources, consume our benefits, and put our country at an economic disadvantage.

But again, if we take that and then actually look at the underlying facts, we see a far different picture. The Congressional Budget Office has recently scored the comprehensive immigration reform proposal from the Senate and has found that over the next 10 years it will net \$197 billion in deficit reduction for the United States. That's a huge positive for this country, and that's by the numbers by a nonpartisan analysis of the facts. The next 10 years following that first decade, it jumps to almost \$700 billion in deficit reduction. Those are net positives to this country.

Even for those immigrants who are here today in an undocumented status, we find that they are net contributors to our economy and to our tax system rather than net beneficiaries in terms of drawing down those benefits and resources. So any way you look at it, any way you cut it, immigration to the United States is positive.

Again, the factors that we see today in Mexico lead us to believe that the situation will only get better. Mexico is the 14th-largest economy in the world by GDP. It's expected to grow from this year to 2016 by almost 5 percent annually. The lowest unemployment rate in all of Latin America is in Mexico today, and we expect it to fall as low as 3.5 percent by 2016.

If we have net-zero migration from Mexico today, I think there's a good case to be made that it will be a negative number by 2016. There is absolutely no sense in building 1,000 miles more of walls, of spending \$50 billion in doubling the size of the border patrol, for a threat that does not exist, for a problem that does not exist.

I think we've illustrated where those resources would be better spent—to create more jobs, more economic growth, and more positive development for the U.S. economy and for our country.

Someone who I think has been quite articulate on this issue in the past, especially from his perspective on the U.S.-Mexico border in Arizona, is representative RAÚL GRIJALVA, and I now yield such time as he may consume so he can illustrate the positive dynamic of the U.S.-Mexico border.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague from Texas, Congressman O'ROURKE, for organizing this discussion, a discussion that needs to happen. A discussion that talks about the border in a full context is drowned out by the shrillness, the overreaction, and a rhetoric that sometimes borders or crosses into hatred and fear.

I represent District 3 in southern Arizona, 300 miles of border between the U.S. and Mexico that I happen to have the privilege to represent. Border communities, such as Nogales, San Luis,

and Sasabe are all part of this district that I represent. I grew up in those borderlands, borderlands that share a common history, heritage, and share a common dependency on the economic development and the jobs and the social welfare of those borderlands. That dependency is with our neighbors across the border in Mexico.

I want to talk a little bit about looking at this context in very human terms, in geographical terms, and in historic terms. The discussion on immigration reform, when it comes to the issue of security, has been about how much more can we do in order to satisfy, in order to accommodate, and in order to draw more support for a comprehensive immigration reform package. I understand the logic, but I—certainly with the Corker amendment—don't understand at all the overkill and the excess.

To double the number of border patrol agents without a strategic plan, without accountability for the 18, \$19 billion that has been spent on this border up to this point, I think is throwing money, potentially good money, after bad.

Second of all, to look at technology as the answer, we should also be looking at addressing our ports of entry, addressing the very, very real need of understaffing among Customs agents that are essential both to security and the flow of goods and services, trade, and economic development.

My colleagues have indicated how many jobs depend on this trade. This is the second-leading trading partner in the world for the United States, Mexico is. We cannot have a border whose sole purpose is to shut down the availability of goods and services and to cripple and constrain the very trade that we need for economic development in this country. Many jobs depend on it, and certainly the health and well-being of the region depends on it.

The excess of security, based on the amendment to the legislation in the Senate, the overkill, as I called it—I think one has to harken back to discussions that have been before this floor in the past, and that has to do with how much is enough. I will take a very, very safe bet that regardless of how much, how many, and how much money is spent on security along that border—how high the fence is, how long the fence is—that there will still be those who get up on this floor and on the other Chamber's floor and demand more without a plan, without accountability, and without an audit for what's been done at this point.

Let me discuss the current state of security on the border—the largest numbers of deportations, the largest number of detentions, 20,000 Border Patrol agents on the border, largest number of apprehensions, and the reduction in unauthorized entries into this country, significant reduction. The plan in place to deter is, like it or not, working. And for us to layer that with additional money, additional personnel, is,

I think, to me pure political symbolism and doesn't really address the issue of security.

If you want to address the issue of security, you must deal with the ports of entry primary, you must fully staff Customs, and you must have the very necessary blend on the border of security, trade, economic development, and necessary and important exchange with Mexico.

□ 1640

Two issues: the humanitarian issue in Arizona.

Arizona has been ground zero on the question of immigration and immigrants beginning with State Law 1070, which was thrown out by the Supreme Court, beginning with various legislative efforts at the State level to make immigrants a target in that State, many of those legislative efforts having been successfully defeated in the courts.

The flow of drugs should be the point of concentration, the organized crime on both sides of the border, the gunrunning there, drugs coming this way, people-smuggling and the abuses associated with that. If there is going to be a security initiative as part of this new comprehensive immigration reform, let's be focused, let's be real, and let's address the real problem and the humanitarian crisis.

Over 6,000 souls have perished in the desert in southern Arizona, in my district, and on the O'odham reservation—people desperate, people being left there by coyotes. It's a humanitarian crisis. If the money we are talking about for enforcement does not include rescue, humanitarian relief, then it's money that's not addressing the problem.

I guarantee you that, over a 10-year period, if 6,000 people were to perish in any other part of this world, we would be calling it a human rights and a humanitarian crisis. It doesn't get the attention it should, but the tragedy continues. With this increased security, people will look for further and further, more desolate areas in which to attempt or to be dropped off by smugglers. Again, the deaths will increase. I suggest that that has to be part of it.

Oversight in the context of security needs to be part of it. Human rights abuses along the border due to the increased militarization has to be part of it. A uniform policy for the use of lethal force has to be part of it. The GAO report on those very procedures I just mentioned has to be completed, and those recommendations need to be implemented before we continue to talk about giving more money without taking care of the civil rights, due process, and humanitarian crisis that we have on the border.

We have an opportunity in this Congress to finally reform this broken system of immigration. We have an opportunity to do it in a just, humane, fair, and secure way. As we go forward with the debate in this House, let us hope

that the discussion is over facts, that it's rational, that we talk about the human quotient involved in this discussion and not the pandering, fear-mongering and divisions that have marked this debate in this House, to which the leadership of this House instructs its Members. Let this be a debate about the future of this country, not the divisions of this country.

I want to take time again to thank Congressman O'ROURKE, a freshman who has taken leadership on this issue and on that of the borderlands, and I am very grateful for his organizing this.

Mr. O'ROURKE. I thank my colleague from Arizona for talking about the moral dimension of this issue and for putting a human face on a problem and also on the opportunity, the other side of that problem, that being the opportunity we see along the U.S.-Mexico border.

To add a little bit to what he said, if you just look at the numbers in terms of northbound apprehensions along our southern border, 7 years ago the average agent apprehended 106 migrants for every agent patrolling the line. Last year, it was 17. In the El Paso sector, it was 3.5.

The Corker-Hoeven proposal to add more than 800 miles of additional border fencing to the tune of billions of dollars in order to double the size of the Border Patrol to the tune of more than \$40 billion is a solution in search of a problem. Not only that—not only is it a waste of taxpayer money—it is also going to cause harm and death along the border. Last year, 477 people, human beings, died in trying to cross the southern border. It's the second highest number on record despite historically low migration. So, as we build these walls and fortify our border, we push people who are coming here for economic reasons further out into more treacherous, harmful and deadly terrain—and they are dying. More than 5,000 people have died in this manner over the last 15 years. Today, someone is eight times more likely to die crossing than one was 10 years ago.

Whether you look at this issue from a moral perspective, what we are doing in proposing the Corker-Hoeven amendment to comprehensive immigration reform is wrong. Whether you're looking at it from an economic perspective, where we have record job growth and creation related to our trade and commerce with Mexico, shutting that down and not applying resources to facilitating that trade is wrong. When you look at it in terms of good policy and being good stewards of taxpayer money at a time of sequester and at a time of deficits and record debt, this proposal is wrong. I do want to say that comprehensive immigration reform is a good thing, and we want to see it move forward, but let's not attach proposals like this one to it that will do far more harm than good and may imperil its chances of success in this House and for this country going forward.

Before I close, I do want to yield to my colleague from the Rio Grande Valley, FILEMON VELA, who wants to make sure that we are focusing on problems where they truly exist, not where they have been created for political purposes.

Mr. VELA. Thank you, Mr. O'ROURKE. I just have one final point to make.

In neither Chamber nor, for that matter, in neither party, do we hear talk these days of two things that I think are very crucial to the debate, and that is the violence in Mexico. Both countries have an obligation to ensure that we eliminate that violence. Second is the economic development along the U.S.-Mexico border. The Mexican economy is doing exceedingly well in central Mexico; but along our U.S.-Mexico border, we still have a lot to go.

Until we address those two things—the violence and the economic conditions along the border—we are going to have a very difficult time solving this entire problem.

Mr. O'ROURKE. I thank my colleague from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that what we have discussed today has been able to illustrate the positive dynamic of the U.S.-Mexico border.

What we have offered historically to this country, whether it is Ellis Island for much of Latin America or the economic growth that we've seen, not just along the border and in border States but for this entire country, 6 million jobs depend on the commerce and trade that cross our ports of entry along the U.S.-Mexico border today.

I hope we have also been able to illustrate how harmful policies don't just hurt the U.S.-Mexico border but how they hurt the rest of this country in our ability to grow this economy and create more jobs.

Lastly, I hope that we've been able to show a positive way forward where we can have comprehensive immigration reform, where we can respond to concerns about a secure border but do so in a way that does not sacrifice our economy, our way of life, and our Constitution.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

JOB, SECURITY, AND THE WELL-BEING OF THE COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for 30 minutes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I will be joined by my colleague from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), whom I will recognize at the appropriate time.

We wanted to make this Special Order this evening about solution-driven legislation and about the need on behalf of the United States Congress to

come together in a nonpartisan manner and get after the concerns that this Nation cares so deeply about, most notably those as they relate to jobs and security and the well-being of the country.

This evening, Mr. Speaker, what if I told you that we could deal with all of the rising costs of health care, bring down the national debt and that we could do so while providing better quality, coordinated patient-centered care?

□ 1650

There might be some skepticism. What if I further told you that we could do it without raising taxes or cutting Medicare? In fact, what if we did it by extending the benefits of Medicare?

What if I were to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this idea germinated with the Heritage Foundation, a conservative organization dedicated to conservative ideas, and was piloted by a Republican Governor in a Democratic State and served as the basis for what we now call the Affordable Health Care Act?

The Affordable Health Care Act, in its final form, was something that a number of colleagues on the Democratic side didn't necessarily prefer. It was not their first choice. A number wanted to see a single-payer system or Medicare for all, but that is not what transpired and that is not what is the law of the land nor is what is upheld by the Supreme Court.

We need, in this body, a paradigm shift that will allow us to come together and embrace the ideas that we all agree upon in a way that we can move this Nation forward. The budget leader in the Republican conference is PAUL RYAN, a distinguished, bright, and capable gentleman. We agree that health care costs are what are driving our national debt. There is no doubt about that. Statistics will reveal that.

Further, when it comes to improving patient care, patient outcomes, making sure that we provide for our elderly, making sure that we have a continuum of care for people, that's something that's neither Democrat nor Republican. That's something that is truly American and that we all agree on.

Where we may disagree but where we can come together is in recognition of how we get to the solution, solve this problem, instead of these endless "tastes great, less filling" debates that go on in the United States Congress. To do so, you have to be bolstered by studies.

This slide will show that there are no less than 10 different studies that have been authored by private sector individuals that all point to one thing: that there's \$750 billion to \$800 billion annually that's wasted in fraud, abuse, and inefficiencies.

This evening, we want to focus on the inefficiencies, noting of course that fraud, abuse, and waste are very important, have been documented several times on "60 Minutes" and other notable sources as well, and certainly is

something that will help us in terms of bringing down the costs of health care, which, of course, solves our problems with the national debt.

Health care costs in the United States of America have risen to 18 percent of our gross domestic product. This next slide will demonstrate clearly that we are way above every other Western democracy, and this is what the inefficiencies of a system have produced: a hodgepodge system that is inefficient and driven upward in its cost because of the lack of coordinated care and outcomes that suggest a new paradigm shift and people coming together and embracing that which is in the public health care system that works and does extraordinarily well, all that's in the realm of science, technology, and innovation that we get from the National Institutes of Health and for the Centers for Disease Control that have been taxpayer funded and produced miraculous opportunities and a better quality of life.

Then, thirdly, to embrace that with the private sector, entrepreneurial efforts to drive inefficiencies out of a system. This chart demonstrates how that can be done and that there is both the profit in doing it for the private sector and the results of lowering that cost for the public sector and an outcome for patients that is centered around wellness, their well-being and their security in the later years of their life. It's that combination that we believe can work.

How do we know that that is so? We're fortunate to see, even in this time of politics where there has been disagreement and too much politics around the quality of health care, that our citizens rightly deserve and the private sector in our hospitals with our doctors, with our surgeons, with our medical devices, and with our entrepreneurship are coming to embrace. The passage of the Affordable Health Care Act is, in fact, a paradigm shift.

What do we need to shift to? How do we need to move that forward? Mark Bertolini, the president of Aetna, based in Hartford, Connecticut, said that the one thing we have to make sure of is that we're not taking away benefits from people who are going to pay for the medical devices—the hospitals, the doctors, the insurance, and the pharmaceuticals that they all need. We need to enhance that system.

Economists like Clayton Christensen have talked at length about how we need to be disruptive in economies, and in doing so, disruptive in terms of our innovation. With the genomic projects at hand and the potential for people to be living well beyond the age of 100 for my children and for current generations, as we all know obviously living longer, there's a need for us to embrace commonsense solutions and not issues that either say we have to drive down the debt at the expense of beneficiaries or that we have to raise taxes to help the beneficiaries.

How about we drive out the inefficiencies within the system, get after

the fraud, abuse, and the waste, and work together as Democrats and Republicans and achieve the goals that we were sent here to do by both lowering the national debt and securing the future by making sure that there is Medicare there for all of our recipients?

I think of so many people nearing the age of retirement who get trapped in this gap. Once you turn 56, you start thinking, Is my company going to keep me to age 65? What is going to happen to my pension? But most importantly, what is the bridge I'm able to take to get to Medicare and will it be there? There's got to be a resounding "yes," and the important thing is that there's a path forward to this.

Two things that are important to remember:

One, that the national debt is real and that we all agree that it has to be addressed, and the primary driver is health care;

Secondly, Medicare is not an entitlement. It's the insurance that people paid for. It's taken out of your paycheck. And if we drive the inefficiencies out of the system, we actually can enhance the Medicare system and make it solvent well into the future while paying down our national debt.

□ 1700

That should be the focus of the United States Congress. It will help the economy, but most of all, it will help people in terms of the quality of care that they need. This is what we hope to achieve in Special Orders and prevailing upon our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together and discuss solutions that will both reduce the debt and preserve the Medicare system.

A person who understands this better than most, who has made firsthand trips to hospitals and has written books, in fact, or at least a book, as I seek to credit you beyond your authorship, Mr. RYAN, but certainly someone who understands the importance of coordinating care in such a manner that an enlightened new Republic that we are will be able to participate in the wholeness and wellness that can come from this paradigm shift afforded by the Affordable Care Act, and where reasonable minds can come together to achieve these goals. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman, and I would like to say a deep thank you because I think this is one of the key issues that we need to address as a country in order to have healthier citizens, have a healthier economy, and drive down the national debt. As you said so eloquently, the big driver for our national debt and deficits are the Medicare and Medicaid programs, issues dealing with health. Look at what is weighing down businesses right now. Small businesses especially, huge increases in health care, year in and year out—10, 15, 20, 30 per-

cent. We've all had people come to our office and say, Hey, it went up 90 percent this year. How am I supposed to plan for capital investments? I want to buy a new machine, and on and on and on and on.

Where we start is, the current health care system is not working. We spend \$8,000 per capita in the United States versus \$3,000 in developing countries, and we have worse outcomes. We have worse outcomes here. What we're talking about, what the CEO of Aetna is talking about, is how do we take this system and recognize and begin to appreciate in 2013 in America that if we put some money into prevention, if we pay doctors and nutritionists and dieticians on the front end, we're going to save a boatload of dollars on the back end. Seventy-five percent of health care costs go to chronic diseases that are mostly preventable.

So here we are bogged down by a system when the answer is patient-centered care and having people participate in their own health care. This is a challenge to every American to take responsibility for their own health, their own well-being, and to create a system that incentivizes everyone who is in the system to operate in this fashion and help drive down health care costs in the long run. We all know this intuitively, that if you take care of yourself, your diet matters, your nutrition matters, your exercise matters, your checkups matter, and through the Affordable Care Act, by having everybody covered, it begins to change that business model of having the insurance company incentivized to keep and help people get and stay healthy. I think it's time for us to take the advice of the CEO of Aetna. This isn't JOHN LARSON, this isn't me. We're looking at the statistics here in our country, and we have to say, This is unacceptable. We have so many sick people in our country, and we are doing nothing to prevent them from getting sick in the first place.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. It isn't just the CEO of Aetna. As I was pointing out earlier, a number of studies, whether they be done by Reuters, whether they be done by Dr. Blumenthal and a number of groups focused on this issue, they all arrive at the same conclusion: the system is inefficient in its form, and how do you improve that system. We're at a fork in the road here, as Dr. Blumenthal from the Commonwealth Fund points out. Health care policy, we either are going to end up in a situation, as the poster points out, where we cut payments, reduce benefits, and restrict eligibility for public programs, or we re-engineer health care and improve the health care costs, improve the outcomes for patients.

As Mark Bertolini from Aetna says, the answer lies not in cutting people's benefits but in improving their care. This is the juncture that we're at. It would seem to me that, especially in this body, that we now have an oppor-

tunity. We all agree that the national debt is a problem. We know that health care is the primary domestic driver of that debt. We have an opportunity to change that. We have a structure, the framework of which, as I said in my opening remarks, was provided by the Heritage Foundation and was pioneered by Mitt Romney in Massachusetts as Governor, and done successfully.

Let's expand on that opportunity, only make it better. Make it better because we know the great virtue of public health and all it has meant for the wellness of this country. We know the great strength of our hospitals and doctors and our scientific community, our innovators, our manufacturers, our medical devices, our pharmaceutical companies, we know the great genomic project that is going to have remarkable abilities that are going to enhance the quality of life like we have never seen it before.

Instead of arguing the old wars and the last battles, we have to be embracing the future in a way that makes the American citizenry secure in the outcome of knowing that science, technology, and innovation, their government and the best of the private sector, are all working on their side. It's not a question of choosing one or the other; it's embracing all three in a way that both lowers the costs, demonstrated in study after study after study, and that will also enhance the quality of health for our individuals. So many people in Ohio, I know, have problems that have dealt with this.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And to figure out how to target the technology. We were out at Walter Reed a few weeks ago, going through and seeing all of the various techniques and approaches that are being used for our veterans that are coming back, and they talk about having high-tech health care, high-touch health care. A good portion of our health care costs are driven up by the sickest 1 percent of the people, and the top 5 percent of the people in health care are driving a lot of the costs.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Fifty percent of the costs.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. From the top 5 percent. So 5 percent of the people drive 50 percent of the health care costs. I think what a lot of these folks are finding out, if you can surround that patient, the patients in the center and figure out exactly what's going on and make sure that that patient has preventive care and a consistent doctor and a consistent nurse and somebody to consistently make sure that they are taking their medication, these techniques, these medical homes, these accountable care organizations, to surround the patient to make sure that they get better, and then reward the doctor and the nurses and everybody, the hospital, everybody who is involved for saying, we're not going to pay you the same amount of money every time you see this patient that still has the same problem that they had from the first time they came in; you will be

paid to make them healthy. And that begins to shift the incentive and squeeze some of that excess out of the system that the gentleman from Connecticut talked about.

□ 1710

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Well, you know, inefficiencies, as I said, were going to be our focus. Let's talk about that just from a practical standpoint.

You say the word "inefficiency" and what do people actually think?

Think about the last time you were in any doctor's office, or made any trip to the emergency room, and the number of forms you had to fill out, the number of forms where we have complicated a system that needs to be streamlined.

One of the things that our colleagues and I should embrace is the need for us to streamline regulation in the process so that it becomes simple, cost-effective, electronically or digitally driven in a way that both reduces costs and adds to a better quality of life for the individual.

When Mr. Bertolini speaks, he talks about, as you point out, developing coordinated care with our areas, our centers of expertise. Whether it's the Mayo Clinic or, in Ohio, the Cleveland Clinic, or whether it's Sloan Kettering, whether it's Jackson Labs in the State of Connecticut, by working in conjunction and coordinating the best outcomes, and then also doing this locally, from the bottom up, that coordination, quite frankly, hasn't existed before. That's what's driven our health care costs up so dramatically.

No other Western democracies in the world, some that have more aging populations than we do, face a similar crisis. We have the opportunity to attack this like no other nation in the world.

Just a word about the genomic project. Jackson Labs is located in my district in Connecticut, and they're known for their Nobel Prize winners because of what they have been able to do with mice.

Mice, as I know the gentleman from Ohio knows, because of their lack of an immune system, allow them to be great vehicles to test with respect to breakthroughs in disease and how we deal with disease.

Well, when we add the genomic project to that, and the advances that we can make in cancer, heart disease, diabetes, all of the areas that plague us, we now have, at our disposal, but instead of a multitude of tests, and random testing, we can now get down to an individual's DNA and make that change.

That is enormous cost savings. That is the full embrace of science and technology and innovation. That should be the discussion on the floor here, the greatest breakthroughs and what we're going to do, and how it's American ingenuity, it's American innovation, it's American doctors and surgeons and medical manufacturers and medical devices and chemistry, through pharma-

ceuticals and all the science that we've brought to bear.

We put a man on the Moon in less than 10 years. Can we solve this problem?

Of course we can. And it's on the cusp of being solved.

Let's embrace what the private sector is doing. Let's embrace our scientific and university communities and our labs in a way that we're coordinating with them, coordinating in a way that we drive out the inefficiencies, because our end goal here is the consumer, it's the patient, it's the citizen of this country who's paid tax dollars for this, who's bought into an insurance system, who believes that his country, or she believes that her country, is there for them in their time of need as we make these critical transitions.

The American people want to see us here in this body working together. Let's work around the issues that drive us, the national debt, securing Medicare for the future, and understand that we have the tools, many of which we owe to the public health system, and the innovation, the labs, the Centers for Disease Control, the National Institutes of Health, and all that's been done in our universities, as well as the entrepreneurial expertise and the creation and innovation that comes from our great system.

Let's enjoin that in a way that we solve problems, solution-oriented legislation that gets over the ideological divide and recognizes that we need common outcomes on behalf of the American people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And, I think, take what is working in areas systemically, but also techniques. Up at Walter Reed, for example, they're using things like acupuncture. They're using things that can help with stress reduction. They're using mindfulness-based stress reduction because we now know, in 2013, given all of the brain science, all of the research that the neuroscientists have done all over the country and the world, Dr. Richard Davidson, at the University of Wisconsin, and Dr. Amishi Jha, at the University of Miami, all of the greatest institutions in the United States and the scientists that run these labs, that study the body, study the mind, they know that the future of health care is self-care.

How do we help people reduce their stress?

How do we help some of these soldiers that come back that are on 6, 8, 10, 12 drugs?

We spend \$300 billion a year on pharmaceuticals. That's more than many of the other countries in the world combined. And we're not saying that you shouldn't have prescription drugs, because you're going to need them in this system that appreciates and tries to utilize all of the tools in the toolbox to keep people healthy.

But how do we create a system where a doctor can have more than 5 minutes with a patient?

And it's on to the next one and on to the next one and on to the next one. That's not a system. That is not protecting the integrity of the doctor/patient relationship. And that, in and of itself, can be a healing relationship, being able to sit down with the doctor and find out what's wrong.

How much stress and anxiety do people have when they just don't know what's wrong?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. The gentleman makes excellent points; and it's a point that underscores that, within this system, as the gentleman points out, we are going to need that high quality of care.

But our care coordination problems have been driven by flawed designs. The coordination of care in the new era, with all the science, technology and innovation that we can bring to bear on this problem, and the flawed design of our payment systems, are what we need to correct.

The beneficiaries will not only be our veterans who return home and are in need of our care, but our general population in dealing with this. The exchange is going to present a great opportunity, an opportunity to have a paradigm shift, an opportunity for us to come together and solve major problems.

And you know what? As the gentleman from Ohio knows, if we solve the national debt problem, then we don't have an issue with sequester, we don't have an issue with debt ceilings, and we can get about the infrastructure system that we desperately need in this country to further enhance jobs.

But within the innovation, technology, and manufacture of drugs and of medical devices, and the technology that grows out of health care, we have a whole economy that's ready to burst and boom as well.

That's what we've got to be about. That's what I believe the American people want to see us solving. And I'm glad that we've taken the time this evening to do that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And if you think about what the small business person who's suffered the brunt of these huge health care increases over the last decade or two, 120-some percent increase, I think, in the last 10 years for a small business person, their health care, over that period of time has gone up.

So if you start reducing that cost, the money that business person will have to reinvest can be a stimulant for the economy.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman. I see that our time has expired. I thank the Speaker, and we thank everyone for the opportunity to lay out this case of coordinated care and cooperation, reducing our national debt, and securing Medicare for our citizens.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 27, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1979. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Walter M. Skinner, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1980. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Rules of Practice and Procedure: Enterprise and Federal Home Loan Bank Housing Goals Related Enforcement Amendment (RIN: 2590-AA57) received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1981. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Identity Theft Red Flags and Address Discrepancies Under the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003, as Amended by the Red Flag Program Clarification Act of 2010 (RIN: 3084-AA94) received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1982. A letter from the Division Chief, Policy Division, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Review of Foreign Ownership Policies for Common Carrier and Aeronautical Radio Licensees under Section 310(b)(4) of the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended [IB Docket No.: 11-133] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1983. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, OET, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 15 of the Commission's Rules to Amend the Definition of Auditory Assistance Device in Support of Simultaneous Language Interpretation [ET Docket No.: 10-26] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1984. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Freedom of Information Act received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1985. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Quality Assurance Program Requirements Regulatory Guide 1.33 received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1986. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Fuel Oil Systems for Emergency Power Supplies Regulatory Guide 1.137 received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1987. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, transmitting the 2012 Statements on System of Internal Controls of the Fed-

eral Home Loan Bank of Topeka, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1988. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the sixty-sixth Semiannual Report to Congress of the Office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2012, through March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1989. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the forty-eighth Semiannual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-up, covering the six month period ending March 31, 2013 in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1990. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1991. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1992. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, transmitting the 2012 management report and statements on the system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1993. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-67; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket: FAR 2013-0078, Sequence 3] received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1994. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2005-67; Item XI; Docket 2013-0080, Sequence 3] received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1995. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Updated Postretirement Benefit (PRB) References [FAC 2005-67; FAR Case 2011-019; Item X; Docket 2011-0019, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM23) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1996. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Free Trade Agreement (FTA)-Panama [FAC 2005-67; FAR Case 2012-027; Item IX; Docket 2012-0027, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM43) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1997. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; [FAC 2005-67; FAR Case 2013-008; Item VIII; Docket 2013-0008, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM54) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1998. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administra-

tion's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contractors Performing Private Security Functions Outside the United States [FAC 2005-67; FAR Case 2011-029; Item I; Docket 2011-0029, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM20) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1999. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period April 1, 2013 through June 30, 2013 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a Public Law 88-454; (H. Doc. No. 113-41); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2000. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — General Regulations; National Park System, Demonstrations, Sale or Distribution of printed matter [NPS-WASO-REGS-8546; PXXVPADO515] (RIN: 1024-AD91) received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2001. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification that the Department issued payments to eligible local governments under the Payments In Lieu of Taxes (PILT) Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2002. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Action #3 [Docket No.: 130108020-3409-01] (RIN: 0648-XC686) received June 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2003. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) Program Report to Congress, pursuant to Public Law 109-469; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2004. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's 2013 Annual Report of the Supplemental Security Income Program, pursuant to Public Law 104-193, section 231 (110 Stat. 2197); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 277. Resolution dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Ninth Congressional District of Tennessee (Rept. 113-132). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 278. Resolution dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Forty Third Congressional District of California (Rept. 113-133). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. JONES, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 2504. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD (for herself and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2505. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue certain regulations with respect to motorcoach safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2506. A bill to amend the Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010 to create an expedited procedure to enact recommendations of the Government Accountability Office for consolidation and elimination to reduce duplication; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. JONES, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 2507. A bill to restrict funds related to escalating United States military involvement in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COOK, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. COLE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2508. A bill to authorize the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. SENBRENNER):

H.R. 2509. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 2510. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish within the Department of Defense centers of excellence in the prevention, diagnosis, mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of health conditions relating to exposure to open burn pits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. RADEL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 2511. A bill to achieve domestic energy independence by empowering States to control the development and production of all forms of energy on all available Federal land; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2512. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish clear regulatory standards for mortgage servicers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 2513. A bill to clarify that a State has the sole authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing on Federal land within the boundaries of the State; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2514. A bill to improve efficiency by consolidating some duplicative and overlapping Government programs; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2515. A bill to amend the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding school library media specialists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. CHU, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 2516. A bill to establish dual language education programs in low-income communities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2517. A bill to improve the literacy and English skills of limited English proficient individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2518. A bill to increase the long-term fiscal accountability of direct spending legislation; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 2519. A bill to direct the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance for individuals affected by exposure to Agent Orange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 2520. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit 501(c)(4) entities from participating in, or intervening in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 2521. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand and intensify programs of the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to translational research and related activities concerning cavernous angioma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2522. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and make permanent the Department of Veterans Affairs loan guarantee for the purchase of residential cooperative housing units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARBER, Ms. BASS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida,

Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROSS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2523. A bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 2524. A bill to establish a program to provide incentive payments to participating Medicare beneficiaries who voluntarily establish and maintain better health; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 2525. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize nonprofit institutions of higher education to provide payment to certain third-party entities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2526. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to add a Federal defender representative as a nonvoting member of the United States Sentencing Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Ms. MENG, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. JONES, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ESTY, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. GABBARD, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2527. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide veterans with coun-

seling and treatment for sexual trauma that occurred during inactive duty training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself and Mr. HORSFORD):

H.R. 2528. A bill to establish a task force in the Department of Veterans Affairs to assess the retention and training of claims processors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. GARDNER):

H. Res. 279. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that allocating the appropriate resources to wildland fire management is needed to protect the environment, the economy, and the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

67. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of West Virginia, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 76 urging the Congress to update the Renewable Fuel Standard; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

68. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2007 demanding the Congress protest the proposed closing of Cherrybell Postal Processing and Distribution Center; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

69. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 6 commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the Apology Resolution; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

70. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 7 urging the Congress to increase investment in the Drinking Water Revolving Fund; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

71. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 22 demanding that the federal government extinguish title to Idaho's public lands and transfer title to those lands to the State of Idaho; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources, Armed Services, and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 2504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is pursuant to the following:

1) Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

2) Article I, Section 1- All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD:

H.R. 2505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8, "Congress Shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, among the several States, and with Indian Tribes."

and;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "Congress shall have the Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof."

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 2507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution, which gives Congress the sole authority to declare war.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 2508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution.

(Article I, section 8, clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;)

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 2509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment stating that, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

and

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 providing that "Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . . ."

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 2512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GOHMERT:
H.R. 2513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment stating that "[t]he powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 providing that "Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . . ."

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution, in that all funds belonging to the Treasury may not be withdrawn except according to law.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. §§1, 1 and 8.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 2518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power *** To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 2519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 2520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce, as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common

Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8; Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 176: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 198: Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 269: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 282: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 333: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. VELA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 411: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 436: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 494: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 508: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 519: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 535: Ms. HAHN and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 556: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. JONES, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 578: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 609: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 621: Mr. STOCKMAN and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 633: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 637: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 647: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 685: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 693: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 698: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 713: Mr. TURNER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 719: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 755: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 822: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 850: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 853: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 892: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 903: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 904: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 940: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 961: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 974: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1020: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 1027: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1140: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1148: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1180: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1187: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1242: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1250: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1261: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1285: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1309: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1318: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 1322: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1323: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1324: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1334: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1336: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1466: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1502: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 1518: Mr. GIBSON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1527: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1563: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1595: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1634: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1717: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 1731: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 1755: Mr. PETERSON and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1761: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1771: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1779: Mr. COLE and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1798: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1801: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1825: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1843: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1844: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1852: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 1864: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1875: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 1886: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1902: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1908: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1918: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1921: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1926: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1966: Mr. SABLON, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1918: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1971: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1982: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 1992: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2016: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2026: Mr. DENHAM.

- H.R. 2029: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2030: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2051: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2053: Mr. LATTI, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BOUTSTANY, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2055: Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2094: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 2099: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2175: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2182: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 2194: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2210: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2218: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2310: Mr. KLINE, Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2313: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2317: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2333: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2347: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2349: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2351: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 2399: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2408: Mr. COLE and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2415: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2422: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2429: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 2446: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 2449: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 2456: Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 2458: Mr. SALMON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 2459: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2482: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2495: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.J. Res. 27: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SENBRENNER, and Mr. PERRY.
H. Con. Res. 36: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 35: Mr. COTTON.
H. Res. 36: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H. Res. 75: Mrs. CAPITO.
H. Res. 109: Mr. WALZ.
H. Res. 136: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H. Res. 190: Ms. NORTON and Mr. COLE.
H. Res. 211: Mr. COURTNEY.
H. Res. 227: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. ISRAEL.
H. Res. 250: Mr. LANKFORD.
H. Res. 273: Mr. KEATING, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. COOK.